

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

JULY 5 AND 6, 1955

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

NOV 2 1955



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

SAN DIEGO

July 5, 1955:

Testimony of —	Page
Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider	1908
Stanley M. Gue	1938
Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider (resumed)	1947
Mrs. Celia Shermis	1965
John Kykyri	1968
Bert O. Dugdale	1971

July 6, 1955:

Testimony of —	Page
Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider (resumed)	1975
Harry Steinmetz	1984
Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider (resumed)	1997
Arthur Stevens	2018
Mrs. Mignon Jenkyns	2022
Leo C. Lueb	2025
Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider (resumed)	2028

Index	i
-------------	---

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA

TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
San Diego, Calif.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a. m., Chamber of Commerce Building, 435 West Broadway, San Diego, Calif., Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel; William A. Wheeler, staff investigator; and Deputy Sheriff Robert S. Newsom, San Diego County.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, has appointed Representative Doyle, Representative Jackson, and myself as chairman of the subcommittee, Representative Walter. The full subcommittee is present.

The Congress of the United States has imposed upon this committee the duty of making investigations of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government guaranteed by our Constitution, and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

In that respect this committee's activities are different from the usual congressional activities because of the duty imposed upon it by the Congress of the United States by an overwhelming vote to make the American people aware of the fact that within our midst there are those who would destroy us.

In the discharge of the foregoing legislative duty, this subcommittee will make inquiry concerning the extent, character, and objectives of the Communist Party activities in the area of San Diego. Preliminary investigation has indicated that members of the Communist Party have been placed in strategic administrative and policy-making positions in certain organizations within this area.

It will be the further purpose of the committee to ascertain whether such individuals have been so placed as part of the Communist Party plan, the method used by the Communist Party in the accomplishment thereof, and the extent of such practices.

It is the standing rule of this committee that any person named in the course of the committee hearings as a member of the Communist Party be given an early opportunity to appear before this committee if he so desires, for the purpose of denying or explaining any such testimony. I might add, under oath.

Should an individual desire to take advantage of this invitation, he should communicate with members of the committee staff.

I desire to caution the audience in the hearing room against any demonstration of approval or disapproval of the testimony of any witness or the action of the committee. You are here as guests of the committee and any violation of this direction will necessitate the ejection of the offender from the hearing room and clearing of the room of all visitors.

There will be no television or radio broadcasts of radio recordings of these hearings. No photographs will be taken during the course of the witness' testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

I would like to call as the first witness Mrs. Anita Schneider. Will you come forward, please, Mrs. Schneider.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, will you state your name, please.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. My name is Anita Bell Schneider.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born, Mrs. Schneider?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Burbank, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived in California all of your life?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Practically, with the exception of the time that I was in service.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I received my degree in sociology and economics from San Diego State College.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please what your record of employment has been since graduation from college?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Since my graduation from college I was working for Deputy Sheriff Robert Newsom of the sheriff's office and in August of 1951 I began working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I worked for them until December 1954.

Since the time I was working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation I began working for the county of San Diego as a group counselor for the Juvenile Home.

MR. TAVENNER. You spoke of having been in the military service. What was the character of your service?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. I was a control-tower operator in the Navy during World War II in 1944 and 1945.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you in the organization known as the WAVES?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes. After that time I served for about a year in the Navy Reserve.

MR. TAVENNER. You stated that you were employed by Mr. Newsom. That is Mr. Robert S. Newsom, deputy sheriff of San Diego County?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; that is true.

MR. TAVENNER. When did that take place?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. I believe I began working for him in February or March of 1951. Sergeant Newsom came on to the State college campus, investigating the activities of two party members on campus.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you mean Communist Party members?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I do. He was to investigate Communist Party activity on campus.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the occasion of his employing you at that time?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. I was president of the International Relations Club. I don't know whether he was investigating my viewpoint at that time or the viewpoint of some of the club members.

He asked me my opinion of them. I said I thought they were dangerous and shouldn't be allowed to influence other students. He then asked me to start attending meetings of Communist front organizations.

MR. TAVENNER. I think at this time I will interrupt the chronology of your statement and ask you whether or not at a later time in the course of your experience you found that there were individuals who were being placed by the Communist Party in various schools to take college courses, that they were transferred from one college to another without thought of obtaining a degree or completing their college work.

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I know that is true. One of the same men that he was investigating at that time, 4 years ago, subsequently was moved to the University of Oregon and is still attending up there. I think he has been in school that I know of for at least 12 years organizing the students on campus.

MR. TAVENNER. So you were asked by Mr. Newsom your views as to whether or not certain individuals were of real danger to the other students?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I was. I felt very strongly that they were extremely dangerous.

MR. TAVENNER. As a result of that conversation with Mr. Newsom, what occurred?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. He asked me to attend one of the Communist front organizations, the Civil Rights Congress. He asked me to listen to what they taught, listen to how their speakers spoke, and if I found they were dangerous to the American way of living he asked me to continue attending meetings and make reports on them, and I did.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you make those reports to him?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At first I did. I was subsequently moved to the FBI and made reports to them after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. After it was ascertained as to the character of the information which you were receiving, what action was taken by Mr. Newsom to your knowledge?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. When it became apparent that I would be accepted into the Communist Party, Mr. Newsom made an appointment with me to discuss it with the FBI. I did and subsequently worked for them.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say you worked with the FBI, do you mean you worked in the Communist Party for the FBI?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, just how you became a member of the Communist Party? In doing so, I do not want you to divulge any information that would be harmful to the procedures of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am merely asking you now to tell us who took you in to the Communist Party and the circumstances regarding it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I had been given leaflets from time to time by many members of the local Communist Party, among them Arthur Stevens gave me some and Lolita Gibson. I drove to one of the Civil Rights Congress meetings at which Carmen Edwards was attending. They gave me a copy of, I don't know, an outline of the Communist Party program, I believe it was, and history of the Soviet Union, Bolshevik in parentheses. I took them to Lolita Gibson after that, told her if they had not been authorized by the Communist Party, I didn't want them. If they had been, I very much wanted to join the Communist Party. She said she thought she knew someone who might be in the Communist Party and would check on it. Several weeks later I was told that I had been accepted into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the approximate date of your actual entry into the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I believe it was some time in August 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said some particular document was turned over to you about which you inquired as to whether or not it was a Communist Party document. Did I understand you correctly?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of that document?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was a short history, a little white pamphlet, a short history of the practices and the principles of the Communist Party, I believe. I don't remember the exact title.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document and ask you whether or not this was the document which was handed to you.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; this is the document.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to mark the document for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 1." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of the Communist Party under your own name or did you use a pseudonym?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know how it appeared on the record. I used my own name in approaching the Communist Party but I was also given a Communist Party name of Seeta, S-e-e-t-a.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I remained in the Communist Party until January 1955.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason of the termination of your membership at that time?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I had decided to leave San Diego, I had rented my house and packed all my things. Several Communist Party members had come to the house and the Communist Party was aware of my leaving. The date that I was leaving Verna Langer, L-a-n-g-e-r, the head of the Communist Party in San Diego at that time, telephoned me and asked me to come to her house. I did. She asked me what I was doing. I said I was leaving San Diego. She said she hated very much to do it, but under the circumstances she had to inform me that I was no longer a member of the Communist Party.

She gave a reason for it. She said that I had been instructed not to tell anyone that I was a Communist Party member and had done so. So that I was being expelled.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she know at that time that you were working for an investigative agency of the United States Government?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; she did not. In fact, I was also given the name of someone to approach in Oregon, the same student that was on campus and transferred later to the University of Oregon with the idea that when I did arrive in Oregon I could contact him and perhaps if I crawled long enough and far enough get back into the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did this woman live?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Verna Langer lives in the 5900 block in Adelaide Street. It is in East San Diego near La Mesa. Do you want the exact address? I do have it here.

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is all right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I might refresh the committee's recollection about her. In an investigation we conducted in 1952 in Michigan many leads led to her name as occupying a certain place in Detroit which was used as a mail drop by the Communist Party. We ascertained at that time the Communist Party had sent her to California.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why I asked where she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. We had no idea at the time she was in San Diego. But our subsequent investigation disclosed that she was the head of the Communist Party in San Diego.

Will you tell the committee, please, about the first meeting of the Communist Party that you attended, if you can recall?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. One of the first meetings that I attended was on a trip to Los Angeles. I drove to Los Angeles with Arthur Stevens and Lolita Gibson. At that meeting we discussed what my future role in the Communist Party would be. We discussed whether I should be chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum, secretary of the Independent Progressive Party, or should hold an office in the Civil Rights Congress.

It was decided that because I hadn't been known long, I, as a Communist Party member would be of most value in the Peace Forum.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question at this time? Was there any question in the mind of these two individuals as to their ability to place you wherever they wanted to as in any of these capacities mentioned?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; the only disagreement was in which one I should be.

Mr. JACKSON. But there was no question as to whether they had the ability to appoint you an officer of the Civil Rights Congress or an officer in the Independent Progressive Party or an officer in the Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. None at all.

The CHAIRMAN. This was all part of the Peace Crusade; wasn't it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir; it was part of the American Peace Crusade nationally, the Southern California Peace Crusade on a regional basis and our own unit was the San Diego Peace Forum.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very much disturbed lest the present activities of the Communists in Russia aren't a part of that same Peace Crusade and designed to again deceive the American people into believing that the objective of world formation has been abandoned. There is every indication that that is what is happening now as part of that Peace Crusade.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period from 1951 until 1955 did you become a functionary in the Communist Party in the sense of holding a Communist Party position?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Most of those who have worked within the Communist Party and have appeared as witnesses before this committee were elevated to positions of importance in the Communist Party organization itself.

Was there anything unusual about the operations of the Communist Party in this area which would require activity on your part in some other capacity than that of an officer of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know what you mean. There are several reasons I think that I wasn't given a job as a functionary in the party. One of them was that my husband was in the Navy. They felt it would be bad for his Navy career, quite rightly, and at one time I was offered chairmanship of the local Communist Party and turned it down because I can't give people directions for Communist Party activities and then report them for doing the same thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was a position found for you within various mass organizations?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. In fact, I don't see how I would have had any time to be a functionary in the party, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what assignments, Communist Party assignments, you had within the mass organizations, as they are frequently called?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum, as far as I know I still am. I was on the Independent Progressive Party county central committee for some time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Central committee?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean of the State or county?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The county.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was secretary of the State Independent Progressive Party Convention in 1952. I was regional delegate to Los Angeles on many occasions during this same period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Regional delegate to what?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. To the State executive meetings at Fresno.

Mr. TAVENNER. Meetings of what?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Independent Progressive Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was national delegate to the Independent Progressive Party Convention in Chicago in 1952. I was secretary of the women's division of the Independent Progressive Party also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were these assignments all Communist Party assignments?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they were all discussed in the Communist Party at our club meetings before I took the jobs and before I carried them out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was a member of the Civil Rights Congress although not a functionary in that group. I belonged to the Negro Labor Council. I belonged to the Fair Employment Practices Committee that was founded here. I was chairman of the Paul Sleeth Defense Committee at one time. I was chairman of the Bill of Rights Defense Committee at one time. I was secretary of the Emory Collier Defense Committee.

I can't recall any other organizations I was active in but I know there were some.

Mr. TAVENNER. You engaged in all those activities, as I understand it, at the instance of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the performance of that work, did you have an occasion to meet members of the Communist Party—that is, functionaries of the Communist Party—on a higher level or State level?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did. For security reasons within the Communist Party the actual method of operation of the party was very often concealed from the members themselves and you very seldom knew what was happening at a higher level than your own.

I did meet some of the functionaries, however. I met Bernadette Doyle in Los Angeles. I met several of the national people who were not Communist Party functionaries to my knowledge, but were national functionaries in their own Communist-front organizations such as William Patterson, Aubrey Grossman, Dr. John Kingsbury, A. B. Magil, Sender Garlin, Isobel Cerney.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. C-e-r-n-e-y. Horace Alexander, Jack Berman, B-e-r-m-a-n. I met Frank Spector. I met Maud Russell, Ben Orel, I could also go through my address book if you want me to.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that is sufficient for the present.

You will probably have occasion to refer to activities of these various individuals in the course of your testimony.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the organizational setup was of the Communist Party in this area as far as you were able to discover?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. As far as I was able to discover, the Communist Party in San Diego was divided into small groups composed of three members. The chairman of my group was always the county central

committee chairman. Representatives sent from the Communist Party clubs were theoretically members of the sectional committee. The sectional committee was to send delegates to the county committee of the Communist Party county committee and to my own knowledge the chairman of the county committee met with functionaries of the Communist Party in Los Angeles and receive their directions there. I did find out that William Schneiderman was the head of the 13th district here in California and that is as far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the members of the group or unit of the Communist Party that you were assigned to?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The first Communist club that I was assigned to was composed of Celia Shermis and Verna Langer. When the Shermises moved to Los Angeles that group then was dissolved. I met with Verna Langer alone for a short time then with John and Dorothy Kykuri. When the Kykiris returned to Los Angeles I began meeting with Verna Langer again and did that until I left San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Shermis?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. S-h-e-r-m-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion at any time to attend executive board meetings or become aware of action that was being taken at executive board meetings?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, at one time when I first entered the Communist Party the peace forum executive board decided to use a school building for its meeting. The executive board of the peace forum wasn't aware that we had any Communists on it. They saw no reason why we shouldn't sign a loyalty oath to get the use of the school building as required by State law now. They voted to do so. I was concerned about signing a loyalty oath under the circumstances, and went with the problem to Lolita Gibson and Lolita Gibson took me to Celia Shermis and other members of the executive committee to discuss it with them. The people present at that meeting were Lolita Gibson, Celia Shermis, Verna Langer, Helen Dugdale, and Miriam Starcevic.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of a person named Dugdale. What was the first name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Helen Dugdale.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think at the very beginning of your testimony we should make this clear: Where your description of an event requires you to mention names of persons who are not members of the Communist Party, make that fact clear because in the front organizations there were many people, were there not, who were not members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true, although the majority of the executive people in the front organizations are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I just want to make that clear at the outset, that you use every possible care whenever you are compelled to mention the name of a person in a front organization in order to describe the activity of that organization to tell the committee if the individual is not a member of the Communist Party and make that perfectly clear.

You mentioned the name of Helen Dugdale. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the name of another person whose name had not been called.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I mentioned Lolita Gibson, Verna Langer, Helen Dugdale, Miriam Starcevic.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Miriam Starcevic a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is she the same person who was subpoenaed as a witness before this committee when it met here a year ago and refused to answer questions, relying on the fifth amendment?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she is.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were telling the committee about this instance where a loyalty oath was required to be signed by you in order to get the use of a public building for a San Diego Peace Forum program, is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what occurred?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Then I was told I was perfectly correct about my doubts, that the peace forum should not sign such a loyalty oath. I was given \$25 to rent the Vasa Club, which was not a progressive hall of any sort. I was instructed to tell the peace forum executive board members that some philanthropic person had wanted us to have a nice hall for the meeting and had donated the rental. The money was given by the Communist Party so we wouldn't have to sign the loyalty oath.

I was instructed that during the next month before the next executive board meeting I was to educate the members of the executive board so they wouldn't be willing to sign a loyalty oath after that.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you were informed and you were instructed, you were informed by whom and instructed by whom?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. In this case by Celia Shermis, the chairman of the Communist Party county committee at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did any member of the bar ever inform you as to what steps to take in order to conceal the real purpose of a meeting or an activity?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I can remember on one occasion Richard Rykoff gave us instructions about that. That was in the Emory Collier defense case. We discussed the case in great detail, the reasons for taking the case, and so on. He also instructed me about obtaining a passport. My attendance at a world peace conference in Stockholm was being discussed.

I was worried about getting a passport and he explained the details of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I had that in mind because there has been a drive recently to compel the State Department to divulge the source of information it has when it refuses to grant passports. That is exactly the thing I was hoping you would know about. When you made application for passport to go to Stockholm did this lawyer tell you what to say and what not to say?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I was told not to say that I was going behind the Iron Curtain at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he know that it was your intention to go behind the Iron Curtain?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He pointed out, as a matter of fact, my geography is rather weak, he pointed out that when I reached Stockholm it was just across the bay from the Soviet Union and getting there would be

very simple. It was Dr. John Kingsbury, however, that said it might be simpler since I have a German family background to say I was visiting relatives in Western Germany and then go to Eastern Germany to the Soviet Union.

In any case, the real objective of your visit should not be put on your passport.

The CHAIRMAN. This lawyer advised you not to put the real purpose of your visit on your passport?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. True. Dr. John Kingsbury went into it in some detail. He had his passport and was in France when he was asked to go to Peking, China, for the Peace Crusade, they were having this worldwide peace conference in China, he explained he had been asked for his passport when he returned and had refused to give it up.

Mr. JACKSON. There was no question in the minds of either of these people that you were eventually to make your way behind the Iron Curtain?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Dr. John Kingsbury also advised me to take a course in the Russian language, said he would give me names of people living in the Soviet Union that he knew would be helpful while I was there.

Mr. JACKSON. Were both these people known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Despite all of the misinformation to the contrary, it is a comparatively easy thing to move from the East to the Western Zones in Germany. So that all you had to do and they knew it, of course, was get a passport to France and then Germany and move very easily from the west to the east.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir; it was also explained that transportation from Hong Kong to Red China is very simple, going back and forth is no problem.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know the whereabouts of either of these two individuals at the present time?

Mr. TAVENNER. We are aware of the whereabouts of the attorney. We assume that Dr. Kingsbury is in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. It won't make any difference because the bar association won't act. I notice that the Bar Association of the District of Columbia hasn't acted despite the fact that on numerous occasions members of that bar were placed in the Communist Party and are still practicing and still interfering with the orderly processes of this committee by advising their clients to take the fifth amendment when we know they can throw a great deal of light on the subject that we are charged with looking into.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned a contemplated trip to Stockholm. Did you take that trip?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, I didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go to the extent of filing an application for a passport?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No. I got the application and investigated it through the attorney. I would have liked to have visited the Soviet Union but coming back was a concern, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean, coming back was a concern?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Particularly if my job in the FBI was discovered I doubt that I would have found coming back was simple.

Mr. JACKSON. That is an understatement.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were describing this activity with the executive board of the Communist Party when you were advised to educate the members of the San Diego Peace Forum executive council on the matter of the signing of a loyalty oath.

Now were any of the members of that executive board—I believe you were the chairman of it, were you not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any members of that executive board members of the Communist Party or what policy was adopted with regard to the Communist Party membership of those on the executive board?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. My immediate superior in the American Peace Crusade was Peter Hyun, H-y-u-n, who was head of the Southern California Peace Crusade. He instructed us how to set up our executive board, that we were to elect a chairman and treasurer and secretary and that no other known Communist members should be on that board. When we returned to San Diego and had our election of officers Arthur Stevens, who had been chairman of the Peace Forum, wasn't willing to give up his job quite that easy. He nominated himself program chairman of the Peace Forum and had himself elected in that capacity. Later on when Sender Garlin spoke at the San Diego Peace Forum and Peter Hyun came from Los Angeles with him, we had a Communist Party meeting and I brought up the subject. Arthur Stevens was instructed to withdraw from the Peace Forum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Instructed by whom?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. By Peter Hyun to withdraw from the Peace Forum since he was chairman of the Independent Progressive Party at the time and there shouldn't be duplicate leadership. He did withdraw and didn't perform any more activity for us.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say that decision was recommended at a Communist Party meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was. It was a Communist Party meeting at the home of Howard and Lolita Gibson, who were present and Sender Garlin was present, Peter Hyun was there, Arthur Stevens and I were also there. Although Sender Garlin explained that since he was not an officer in the region that it was incorrect for him to give advice on that matter. He stayed at the meeting but didn't advise us on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You told us a few moments ago that your Communist Party assignment was within the San Diego Peace Forum, that that was decided at a Communist Party meeting which took place en route from here to Los Angeles, as I understand it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose of going to Los Angeles on that occasion?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. On that occasion we were attending the Civil Rights Congress picket line in front of the Hall of Justice in Los Angeles. The Civil Rights Congress was protesting the jailing of the Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you on that occasion have a meeting with Peter Hyun or was it at some subsequent date?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was at a subsequent date. Lolita Gibson and I drove to Los Angeles, I believe that Beatrice Steinberg drove back from——

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Beatrice Steinberg, whose husband, Henry Steinberg, was being tried under the Smith Act. We dropped her off and went on to meet with Peter Hyun.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who accompanied you?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Lolita Gibson and Beatrice Steinberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Lolita Gibson a functionary of the Communist Party here in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she was. She was the person that told me I had been accepted into the Communist Party. I met at subsequent Communist Party meetings with her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this meeting in Los Angeles a peace crusade meeting or was it a Communist Party meeting or what kind of a conference was this that you were having with Peter Hyun.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was a Communist Party meeting. We discussed setting up the San Diego Peace Forum in detail. Peter Hyun said that he had just returned from a national meeting of the American Peace Crusade and that it had been decided in Chicago to divide the American Peace Crusade up into smaller regional sections. In California it would be divided into the Northern California Peace Crusade, under, I think, William Kerner; the Southern California Peace Crusade would be under Peter Hyun and in San Diego it would be called the San Diego Peace Forum.

Peter Hyun explained that he had been taught by Mao Tse-tung in China to divide up into smaller groups. In that way, if a small group was attacked it doesn't wipe out the parent organization. He said it was like hitting a pillow with your fist: although you crush some of it the rest of it is still intact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the Southern California Peace Crusade was a branch or unit of the American Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir; it was. We have received our speakers, our directions, from the American Peace Crusade through Peter Hyun of the Southern California Peace Crusade. We received our petitions, copies of leaflets and mailings from them. We also were expected and required to contribute financially to their support. We were required to make regular reports to them. I was a member of the executive board and reported to Peter regularly about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, as documentary evidence to support the testimony that the Southern California Peace Crusade was a part of the national organization known as the Peace Crusade, I desire to have marked for identification a letter of Peter Hyun on the letterhead of Southern California Peace Crusade bearing date of February 27, 1953, and another letter signed by Peter Hyun, executive director of Southern California Peace Crusade, bearing date of March 26, 1953, and ask that they be marked "Schneider Exhibits 2 and 3," (San Diego) respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Let them be marked.

Where is Peter Hyun now?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Peter Hyun was working for an insurance company in Los Angeles. I think he is still there.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever inform you as to the source of the information he was passing on to this smaller group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He said he had received his training from Mao Tse-tung in China.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Peter Hyun ever testify before the committee, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, to refresh your recollection, considerable evidence was taken during the course of our investigation in Hawaii in 1949 regarding Peter Hyun and his sister, Alice Hyun. When we were in Hawaii Peter Hyun was in the United States. He was identified in that testimony as a member of the Communist Party and as being responsible for burying in the ground certain Communist Party materials which were later dug up and produced in the course of that hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

May I see the exhibit, please. Has this man ever been subpoenaed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. He was subpoenaed for appearance here on the 23d day of June of this year, but due to a situation regarding the inability of members to attend at that time it was necessary to continue the hearing until after the Los Angeles hearing. We were unable to deliver a letter directing him to appear at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly ought to get him subpoenaed and if necessary have somebody sit on his doorstep until they do subpoena him because this is the first link we have seen between one of these relatively minor activities and, to use the present popular expression, the summit. It certainly seems to me it would be worth all of the efforts of this committee and every governmental agency to bring this man in and find out how he received his information direct from China.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want to take the time at the moment to attempt to find the documents here relating to Peter Hyun.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice in this one letter to you, Mrs. Schneider, he said that "Moreover, the new situation created by President Eisenhower's announced spread-the-war policy."

Did they believe that anybody believes that the President of the United States is interested in spreading the war?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir. Not only that, they believed that the job of our own newspapers that they had been hired by the Wall Street capitalists to spread this warmongering idea. They honestly believe South Korea attacked North Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they believe it or do they hope they can influence enough people of meager understanding.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They believe it.

The CHAIRMAN. As a Democrat, I want to say that I have been in Washington a long time and I have never seen a Chief Executive more concerned with just the opposite than is our President.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They believe we have a choice between continuing the war and creating artificial markets for our produce and depression, since they think that Wall Street wouldn't want a depression, of course, we have no other choice than to try to continue the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, one of these people is Dr. W. E. B. DuBois. He is an educated man. Does he believe that sort of tripe, too?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I met Dr. DuBois. I don't believe he does. His wife, Shirley Graham, however, I think, does.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I am asking these questions is because there are two types of Communists, three types actually. One is the

frustrated idealist, shall we say, and the other is a tough, hard-boiled Communist politician. They fall in either of those categories. But I can't imagine anybody who has been beyond high school who believes the stuff that is in this literature.

Go ahead.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were asked by the chairman as to whether or not any documents were received by you for use in the San Diego Peace Forum, which originated with the American Peace Crusade. I hand you four documents and I will ask you to examine them, please, and tell us whether you received them and the source of them.

(Documents handed to witness.)

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe the petitions we received through the Southern California Peace Crusade. The letters, the instructions, I think were mailed directly to me as head of the San Diego Peace Forum. I received many directly from the American Peace Crusade during this time. Peter Hyun also gave me many more.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are these just certain of the documents which you did receive from that source?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there many more?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to have these documents marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 7. (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. They will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any advice from Peter Hyun as to whether or not the San Diego Peace Forum of which you became the chairman, was to be known publicly as a branch or affiliate of the Southern California Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; Peter Hyun said that was the reason for the difference in the names, that we were to be called the peace forum instead of the peace crusade, that we would be given speakers, leaflets, petitions, and we would make our reports to him, I would have a vote on the executive board of the Southern California Peace Crusade, but that officially and publicly we were not to be considered part of it.

Then when the American Peace Crusade was investigated, it wouldn't have a bad effect on the San Diego Peace Forum and vice versa, like Mao Tse-tung taught us, you know, divide up in to small groups.

Mr. DOYLE. Why was that?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. When one is attacked, it won't endanger the others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may we have a 5-minute break at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes. (Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. Come to order, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you received directions from time to time from Peter Hyun. When you received them, what did you do?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was instructed to go to Los Angeles about once a month to discuss the activities of the San Diego Peace Forum with Peter Hyun. After I received my instructions from him I returned to San Diego. In San Diego I told my Communist club meetings about my instructions. At our Communist club meetings then we

worked out the details how to carry out what Peter Hyun had told us. After the details were completely worked out even as far as the color of the mimeograph paper we would use, I would call an executive board meeting of the San Diego Peace Forum, we would go through the motions of setting up a meeting with speakers.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that the activities of the San Diego Peace Forum were carried out pursuant to the directions of the local Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Completely. At one time I was very much criticized because I used pink mimeograph paper. They thought it was suggestive.

The CHAIRMAN. Pink?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they thought it was suggestive.

The CHAIRMAN. It would have to be red to be suggestive.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that Peter Hyun attended a Communist Party meeting in San Diego at which various problems were discussed and you also testified, if I recall correctly, that the initial meeting which was held in Los Angeles when you received your first directions for work in the San Diego Peace Forum was a Communist Party meeting attended by Peter Hyun.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of your own knowledge that Peter Hyun knew or expected you to discuss his instructions with your Communist Party group in Los Angeles before deciding upon the method of carrying out his instructions?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I do. In fact, very often there was a conflict between the directions and the instructions from Los Angeles and the local Communist Party. I would be sent directly from one group to the other with instructions what to say or what to ask to straighten out problems.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any considerable friction develop on the executive council or board of the San Diego Peace Forum as a result of your being a member of the Communist Party and the other members of that executive board being nonmembers of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, a lot of friction did develop. I never did discover how it was possible to carry out the instructions of the Communist Party as to that extent and still have the executive board convinced that they had a voice in what was happening. They actually didn't have a voice at all. As a result the nonprogressive executive board members dropped out almost completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say progressive. What do you mean by progressive?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. When I use the word "progressive" I use it as it was commonly used in the Communist Party. Communist Party members have been forbidden to refer to themselves or their fellow Communist Party members as Communists. It has something to do with going to jail, I think. So instead of using the word "Communist" the substituted "Progressive." When I use it in that sense I mean Communist Party members or the very few people who can be expected to follow Communist Party discipline without actual membership. It is just a polite term for Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, when referring to the word progressive, it might be well to use quotations where you mean it in the Communist Party sense. The Communists would be delighted to see us use pro-

gressive in the true sense and have it confused with progressives in quotations.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They divided in two groups, the Communist Party members are referred to as progressives, and the rest of the people are called liberals, in that end of the political field, and the term "liberal" is a term of contempt. Any one that is liberal just doesn't understand the basic fundamentals of the economic theory.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this time I am not going to ask you any further questions regarding the type of work conducted by the San Diego Peace Forum. I will ask you that later, but not now. I want to ask you at this time whether as a result of the friction that developed, the San Diego Peace Forum was given some additional tasks to perform.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. At one time the friction that we had over the loyalty oath brought it to a head. We had several, well, Dr. Harry Steinmetz was on our Peace Forum executive board at one time or rather he came to our executive board meetings frequently. Laura Miner, also, came. Harry Hicks and his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt? I am sorry to interrupt your chain of thought, but if Laura Miner was not known to you to be a member of the Communist Party you should state it now.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. To my knowledge, Laura Miner was not a member. I have no knowledge of her being a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, as to Hicks.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I hesitate. I didn't ever attend a closed Communist Party meeting with him. I can't identify him as a Communist Party member either.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We were having difficulty within the Peace Forum executive board. We had been thrown out of the local First Unitarian Church. Rev. Peter Samson objected to our leftwing speakers and the use of his church as Communist-front organization, quite correctly, so he and his board of directors threw us out of the church very firmly and publicly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. You mean your San Diego Peace Forum used the church to put on its program; is that what you mean?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; we rented their public hall for our speakers. When Rev. Samson saw the leftwing speakers that we produced he refused to allow us to use his church any longer. Dr. Harry Steinmetz, Laura Miner, and Harry Hicks were members of his church and also on the Peace Forum executive board. Our Peace Forum executive board meetings degenerated into an anti-Unitarian church group. I discussed it with my Communist Party club and it was decided—well, first we had a meeting about that problem directly which was called as a result of four Communist club meetings. I met with Celia Shermis, Lolita Gibson, and Verna Langer, the four of us met and discussed the friction within the organization. We decided that it should be divided into two groups, those of them that were really Unitarian church members should continue working inside the Unitarian church as long as possible. We should separate the Peace Forum completely from the group. Those who were allowed to keep working inside the Unitarian church would continue to work as long as Reverend Samson would allow them to. When he threw them out as he undoubtedly would just as he had the Peace Forum before it,

they should set up a separate group, hire or buy a hall, and continue their operations independent of the Unitarian church itself. This was done.

Mr. JACKSON. Where is Reverend Samson now; if you know?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. As far as I know, Reverend Samson is still head of the local Unitarian church which has no connection at all with any front organization.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to send congratulations to him and suggest that he have a talk with Reverend Fritchman in Los Angeles.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. One of the reasons for the conference is when Reverend Fritchman had been subpoenaed, the San Diego Peace Forum had invited him to come to San Diego to speak at Reverend Samson's church. Reverend Samson refused to allow the meeting to be held.

Mr. JACKSON. In the event my remark should be misunderstood, I should point out that Reverend Fritchman took the fifth amendment before this committee when asked whether he was a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to mean that a cell was actually established in the church for the purpose of trying to influence the members of that particular church in this phony peace movement?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; it was. There were two possible choices that the church could take. One, the Reverend Samson could take a more left approach, he could agree to let the group present the left-wing speakers inside the church, or the members of the church would work as long as possible to make a united group so that when they were ordered out of the church it would split the church.

Reverend Samson refused to give in and the church was split. This group took with them many honest, sincere, liberal Unitarians, unfortunately.

The CHAIRMAN. So that when the Communists within that church group left they were able to deceive a number of non-Communists into going with them?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true. The non-Communists, you see, had no way of knowing this was a deliberate plan that had been planned by the Communist Party board with whom I met. They were standing on the principle of freedom of speech. They did not understand that it was at the direction of the Communist Party that it was being done.

Mr. DOYLE. Then as I understand it, you did that, the Communist members of the San Diego Peace Forum, operating then under orders from the Los Angeles head of the American Peace Forum; is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Including Peter Hyun, who told you himself that he was taking directions as to how to conduct the American Peace Crusade direct from Mao Tse-tung, when Peter Hyun was over in China.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. So it extended from Communist China direct to San Diego to the Unitarian Church; is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir. That isn't the only example of direction. Maud Russell, who was one of the Peace Forum speakers

She was also head of the Committee for Democratic Far Eastern Policy, one of the Peace Forum speakers for a period of years. She also told, she spent something like 2 years in China. She told of having received her Communist Party education from Mao-Tse-tung and gave us directions such as subscribing to such magazines as U. S. News & World Report, the Sunday edition of the New York Times, as well as the leftwing publications.

She said Mao Tse-tung had taught her the best weapons to use against them are their own words, out of context.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive a letter from one of the persons interested in the formation of a new organization separate from the Unitarian Church, a person not a member of the Communist Party, do you recall? Let me hand you this phostatic copy of a letter.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The reason I didn't recognize it, this was a note that was written on the back of one of the leaflets that was put under my door. Yes, this is a letter from Laura Minor to me discussing the formation of this group and how it had been thrown out of the First Unitarian Church in time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read it please?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it says:

DEAR ANITA: Sorry you are out, as I had hoped to chat a bit. I feel very low and needed cheering up. It will be so awful if this first meeting as an independent group (since being kicked out of the church) should turn out to be a fizzle. Can you help us out and get some friend to telephone people? Will call you up later.

LAURA.

This was a note from Laura Minor.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there a date on that letter?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; there is no date on it.

Do you remember approximately when this occurred?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe I received the note about 1953. We had our Communist meeting discussing it in the spring of 1952. They were allowed to work inside the Unitarian Church for almost a year, I believe, before Reverend Samson gave up and threw them out.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to make it clear again that you have not testified that Laura Minor was a member of the Communist Party to your knowledge.

Can you say from your own personal knowledge whether she knew that you were working for the Communist Party at the time this letter was written to you asking for help?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; she definitely did. Actually what she meant by "friends," could I get some of my friends, could I get the Communist Party, in other words, to cooperate and publicize this meeting and help to make it successful. Without the cooperation of the Communist Party it would not be.

I believe the reason for Mrs. Minor's not being a member of the Communist Party is because of her previous criminal record. She was not eligible for membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then this group to which you have referred was not in any way officially connected with the Unitarian Church?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Absolutely not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to make that perfectly clear that this group which the Communist Party was creating and organizing was not affiliated in any way with the First Unitarian Church.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was not only not affiliated, it was not a religious group in any sense of the word. I attended many meetings there over a period of years. I did not hear one single prayer or one single song. They may have taken place, but they were not in my presence. I know one of the men who was one of the liberals who was thrown out of the church, and went with them because of his principles, was referred to with contempt by the Communist Party members. They said they would have him speak on Sunday morning. He would try to get them to go to heaven in the morning and they had other plans for the members that night.

His attempt to bring a religious note into the group was——

Mr. TAVENNER. This individual to whom you refer was endeavoring to maintain some semblance of religious worship in the group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, in all sincerity he believed that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, what Communist Party work was done to assist this group in organizing?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Speakers were sent down, not only from Reverend Fritchman's church in Los Angeles. They were also sent by the Southern California Peace Crusade when the peace Crusade was asked.

We were instructed that we could attend the meetings at the very first, some of us who were quite well known as Communist members forbidden to attend the meetings because they hoped to ally themselves with the national group. When we received our charter we were told we would be allowed to attend. Some time went on, we had not received our charter. Not very many people went. We were told we could attend, we could help actively, we were expected to contribute money to it. We were told when they had speakers we were to sort of hang back and if they had a roomful of people we should be the last ones in, that the education of the outsiders who happened to come was more important than our own education.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I understand it correctly, then, the Communist Party members were asked to hold back and not become active members of this group until after it had obtained recognition by the national church organization of the Unitarian Church, is that what you mean?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is particularly true. Those of us that had been Red baited so much inside the Unitarian Church were told to stay away from the group. The liberal Unitarians in the group would know we were Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether recognition was denied this group by the national organization or the——

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was told it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which I believe is the American Unitarian Association.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was told that it was denied. I know of at least one trip to Boston Laura Minor made an attempt to become member of the national group and that was refused at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then after a sufficient period of time had elapsed the Communist Party members became active in the organization.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, that is true. One ex-Communist Party member applied to me for readmittance into the Communist Party. I took his application to the Communist club meeting I attended. Verna Langer instructed me that this ex-member should start working

in this Unitarian Fellowship, that I could go with him and based on his work in there he would either be admitted, readmitted to the Communist Party or denied admission.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was this individual?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. His name was Obed Rosen. I believe he was subpoenaed by this committee last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. His return to membership was dependent upon his ability to get into this organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not to get in it. His ability to get in the organization wasn't doubted. The quality of his work within the organization would determine his readmission into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I should refresh the recollection of the committee regarding the testimony of Carol Bayne, who came forward, I believe, as a voluntary witness during the course of the hearing here last year and who had been a member of the Communist Party. Upon applying for readmittance at the suggestion of the Federal Bureau of Investigation she was told by Verna Langer that her readmission to the Communist Party was dependent upon her willingness to affiliate with the church. We do not know what church organization was involved, I believe, or was intended to be involved. The witness testified that she couldn't do that and she did not reaffiliate with the Communist Party.

Will you tell the committee, please, what the Communist Party directives were at the time regarding activity of Communist Party members in church organizations?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. When I first joined the Communist Party my church activity was discussed at our Communist club meetings composed at that time of Celia Shermis, Verna Langer, and I. I also discussed it with Lolita Gibson. Lolita explained that work in the Catholic Church was most unproductive from a Communist Party point of view. It didn't produce the desired results.

Work in the fundamentalist-type churches such as the Baptist Church was also unproductive because of what the Communist Party calls the superstition attached to those churches. The middle-of-the-road churches such as Presbyterian and Methodist Churches are useful, in some particular churches they have some social action groups which can be influenced. However, those churches are controlled by a national board and when a minister will allow his church to be influenced too much by the Communist Party he would be removed from his job as head of the church.

So for that reason churches such as the Congregational Church and the Unitarian Church are most useful. When you find a minister willing to listen to you you can influence him and the national board has no control over him. For that reason I was instructed to infiltrate on 2 separate occasions 2 of the local churches. I was not to infiltrate the Unitarian Church because I had already been thrown out of it. That wouldn't be possible. We were all warned that all of us obviously couldn't be working in the Unitarian Fellowship although all of us would prefer being in it, because our influence was of more value if we spread it out.

I know several of the Communist Party members and the churches they attended. Usually the results were very unproductive. For one thing the Communist Party members just couldn't take what they called superstition.

The CHAIRMAN. Then as I understand it their idea was to try to find a minister who was "liberal"?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir; and preferably one that could not be removed by a national board which controlled his church.

Celia Shermis who grew up in an orthodox Jewish family, said one of the things she hated to give up, one of the things she had the hardest time giving up, was her religion when she joined the Communist Party. At the discussion I had with Verna Langer and Celia Shermis about my activity, I also protested against attending the church at the direction of the Communist Party. It seemed sacrilegious. She said if Verna Langer could sing in the choir I could teach a Sunday-school class.

Mr. DOYLE. Why didn't Celia Shermis keep her religion even though she was in the Communist Party? Why did she have to give it up? If she gave it up, why couldn't she keep it and also keep in the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Because following Marxist and Communist Party principles sincere religious principles are not possible. They are completely ruled out by the fact of Communist ideology.

The CHAIRMAN. Like oil and water, they do not mix.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. The record should reflect that we are now receiving testimony in an area in which someone may allege that we are investigating churches. I think that it should be very clear by this time that the only thing we are investigating is the extent of Communist infiltration where there is evidence of Communist action within a church. This constitutes propaganda of the most malignant type and inquiry into the circumstances surrounding such action is well within the purview of the authority of this committee under the charge laid upon it by the Congress.

This is not in any sense an investigation of any religious faith nor of any creed or doctrine.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. As a sincere church member I wish very much that we could protect our churches against the infiltration of atheist ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the favorite devices of the Communists and others is to indicate that an investigation is proceeding against an individual or against a field or profession in order to discredit the committee and its work. That we have seen happen throughout the years.

Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this one question: Isn't there room for reverence for the divine in the teachings of the Communist Party, however it is called?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Absolutely none. Even the so-called allowance of the Communist Party to permit religious practice in the Soviet Union is merely a decision that repressing the religion will keep it going longer inside the Soviet Union. It is a deliberate decision. We were told inside the Communist Party that at the present time large front meetings and so forth aren't possible. They said we have to go where the people are. The people do attend church, the people do have non-Communist-front political organizations. We have to work where the people are. It is a very cold-blooded decision.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of this organization which the Communist Party took over and which had been the skeleton organization which had been expelled from the Unitarian Church?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe it changed its name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you whether the name finally became Community Unitarian Fellowship.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the organization which I understand you to say was not a religious organization but it finally became a creature of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true. I believe we have a notice to that effect in one of the exhibits, a statement of their own, we are no longer a religious group.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Community Unitarian Fellowship.

The CHAIRMAN. Didn't the church make any attempt to prevent the use of the name Unitarian?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know, because I had been expelled from the Unitarian Church. I am certain that based upon Reverend Samson's expulsion and his lecturing of us when we were thrown out, I am certain he made every attempt to prevent it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did these occurrences which you have described begin in 1952 and extend into 1953?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. However, the group is still active, although I didn't describe it, I attended meetings there. I believe the last one I attended was in December 1954, the group is still in operation in San Diego.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was that meeting held?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At 648 Robinson Street. It is called the, I believe, Hillcrest Community Center is the name. It has just recently moved, however to Front Street. I don't have the address.

The CHAIRMAN. Who attended that meeting you attended about 6 months ago?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The speaker was George Marion, who wrote The Communist Trils, and who has written many left-wing books, many Communist Party books, I can't recall at the moment.

He lectured on the "Real History of the World," from the Communist Party point of view. They stayed at my house that night, as my house guests.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Peter Hyun familiar with the progress of this work which began as the work of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; he was. His organization was the one that sent down George Marion from Los Angeles. He sent down speakers from time to time, I know. At one time it became a concern of the Communist Party. If Southern California Peace Crusade sent down one speaker to speak in front of this Hillcrest group and to speak in front of the San Diego Peace Forum at the same time, or within a day or so, the members of the Communist Party and fringe people would all go to one or the other and sometimes divide their membership and as a result one of the groups wouldn't be able to clear expense money on the collection that was taken up.

I was instructed by Verna Langer, who was head of the Communist Party at that time, that they had sent down Hugh Hardymen, had arranged for him to speak for both groups. I was instructed to go to Peter Hyun in Los Angeles and protest that it was impossible for

us to clear our expenses and to instruct him that the local party wouldn't put on the same speakers, if he sent one for two separate groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn that Peter Hyun became a delegate to the American Peace Crusade in the early part of 1953—that is, some convention or meeting of that organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I attended the workshop at which it was voted to send him.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that meeting held, do you recall?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; I don't recall. I believe it was in the early part of 1953, about May 1953, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. After he returned did he make a report regarding what had occurred at the conference of the American Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. The meeting at which he was elected delegate was previous to May. The May meeting was where he presented his report.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now at the time of making this report was there disseminated at the meeting a discussion outline?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine this paper, please and state whether or not it was the discussion outline presented?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This was the discussion outline.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that discussed at this meeting and was it shown on this discussion outline that the American Peace Crusade should at this time in 1953 rather extend its operations into other fields?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. We were instructed that no more meetings should be held with the idea of building up the name of the Peace Crusade or in our case the San Diego Peace Forum itself, that it was a waste of time with the present hysterical climate in the country. We were instructed instead to go into other political or church organizations to become the sparkplugs for peace communities in those groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the Peace Crusade itself should infiltrate other organizations?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And attempt to produce work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, we were told that we should continue reporting to the Southern California Peace Crusade, that regular meetings would be held, instructions would be given; we were expected to report on those activities but no more activity should be undertaken really in our own names.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is virtually what you had been doing here in the San Diego Peace Forum through the organization that you were infiltrating?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, we merely carried out the same activities in those organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that the national organization by this time had caught up to what the San Diego Peace Forum was in fact doing?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was a general change in Communist Party policy at that time that was being carried out in each of the front organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce this document in evidence, the one you have just identified, and request that it be marked "Schneider Exhibit No. 8."

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be marked. Has it been sufficiently identified?

Mr. TAVENNER. She identified it as the discussion outline which was disseminated at the meeting in May 1953, the workshop meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did it come from?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The discussion outline came from the American Peace Crusade. It was given to us by Peter Hyun, I believe, himself, at that meeting. It was quite a large meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. He stated it came from the American Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't remember him stating it. It refers to it openly in the leaflets. The discussion that was outlined was a basis of future action for the entire American Peace Crusade. We were deciding there how to carry out the American Peace Crusade.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I was getting at. This is the outline for the program for the entire United States?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to read 1 or 2 sentences from this discussion outline.

It is our belief that an efficiently functioning American Peace Crusade can and must play an important role in the development during the coming period. Moreover, we are convinced that many of the old methods of work which have characterized the APC during the past must be discarded. In this connection, a number of corrective steps are already underway and others will be taken on the basis of consultation with the sponsors and local peace leaders throughout the Nation. Examination reveals that the supporters of APC constitute themselves a coalition of a certain character.

Now was it in that sense a coalition of a certain character, that you were being directed to get out into church and political organizations to continue the general work of the American Peace Crusade?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

The APC thus has a specific responsibility therefore to conduct its work in such a way as to fully reflect and utilize the coalition strength which is already present. Proper utilization of this strength can go far toward the development of new projects, new steps for the achievement of an ever-widening APC coalition.

When did you cease activity in this organization known as the Community Unitarian Fellowship?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. After the end of the Korean war—Community Unitarian Fellowship—I was active in it until December 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, at the end of the Korean war, in June 1953, which was a little later than the workshop meeting which you told us about, did Peter Hyun give you any further directions regarding the peace forum unit here in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not that I can recall right at the present moment. I was given further instructions about the operation of the peace movement by Dr. John Kingsbury and Elizabeth Moos. When Elizabeth Moos spoke in San Diego she directed me to come to Los Angeles. They were having an international woman's day meeting there. When I came to Los Angeles she introduced me to Reva Mucha, who was head of the American-Russian Institute in Los Angeles. Reva Mucha instructed me to report to her about once a month and told me

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA 1931

SCHNEIDER EXHIBIT NO. 8 (SAN DIEGO)

Peace Workshop

Discussion Outline

The State of the Union Message of President Eisenhower outlined a domestic and foreign program of the new Administration which presents a major challenge to the American peace movement, if the will for peace of the American people is to find expression in the policies of government.

The Southern California Peace Crusade has, for the past two years, been working for a simple, but basic peace program: peace in Korea, Great power negotiations and world disarmament. While events since the Chicago Congress which set this program would demand the addition to it of upholding the right of peoples to choose their own way of life without outside interference, this program nevertheless still contains the essential requirements for world peace and defines the goals of our work.

With the advent of the new Administration, it is now necessary for us to examine the meaning of its actions and of its projected foreign and domestic policies in order to plan the most effective way for the Crusade to advance the realization of its goals. We must evaluate the role which the Crusade can and should play in the midst of the developments at home and abroad which will result from the attempt to carry out the policies of the new Administration.

When the Eisenhower Administration took office, the people of the country and the world were watching to see whether or not our foreign policy would be one which would lead us towards a spread of war or towards successful negotiations for peace.

The great surge to the polls to vote for Eisenhower by women and young people had been occasioned by his statement that he would go to Korea, the implications being that he would seek an end to that war.

During the early days of his campaign, Mr. Eisenhower also indicated that he would be willing to meet with Premier Stalin at any time if it would do any good. However, practical developments since Mr. Eisenhower's election did not point in the direction of an immediate cease fire in Korea, or a meeting with Premier Stalin and leaders of the three other major powers, to negotiate differences which have contributed to the cold war. Mr. Eisenhower made his trip to Korea. Yet the killing and devastation continues in that land. Persistent rumors began to circulate that the new Administration was determined to maintain the hostilities in Korea. Signs also pointed to the determination of his administration to extend hostilities to the mainland of China.

The fears which were occasioned by such developments were heightened by the speech made recently by the new Secretary of State,

John Foster Dulles, in which he stated that it would be the policy of this government to "make the enemy beg for peace in Korea." In the same speech, Mr. Dulles said that the European nations would be expected to fulfill their obligations to NATO or the aid program of this nation would be changed.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower announced the establishment of a 9 member board to unify Psychological Warfare. This step was interpreted by many Washington observers as moving into action around the Eisenhower Administration's avowed aim of "liberating those nations which have Socialist governments."

In Congress we were treated to an unprecedented situation which showed almost 200 Congressmen contending amongst themselves for membership on various investigating committees. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a request of \$200,000 for the investigating committee under Senator McCarthy's Chairmanship.

Particularly the Negro people and organized labor were becoming restless in view of the steps taken by the new administration. Negroes and others concerned with the question of civil rights, noted that the Republican Senate's refusal to change the Senate rule in order to prevent filibustering, did not coincide with the civil rights platform on which Mr. Eisenhower ran.

More and more sections of organized labor began to express concern around the question of the utilization of the Taft-Hartley law and possible new and rougher changes in that legislation.

The perspective of rising prices and a heavy tax burden also disturbed farmers and workers alike.

Women and youth who had looked to Eisenhower for a speedy end of the war in Korea felt cheated as the war continued, although the confusion about the Indian Resolution in the United Nations helped to relieve the new Administration of some of the pressure for ending the Korean war which the election campaign had aroused.

On practically every point of the program on which the new administration stood there were signs of retreat from the election promises.

Then President Eisenhower issued his State of the Union message and the fears of many were confirmed. Many other persons began to express concern as to where the policies of the new Administration would lead the nation. Already voices of conservative spokesmen for the labor movement and for Negro organizations have expressed disappointment or alarm. Public reaction, both here and abroad, has been especially sharp in regard to the implications of the President's order to the 7th Fleet freeing the forces of Chiang Kaishek on Formosa to make attacks on the Chinese mainland. To many people, this action represents a danger for spreading war in Asia.

By fixing the course of government foreign policy more firmly in the direction of reliance on force for the settlement of international problems, the new Administration is setting itself against the express and determined will of hundreds of millions of people in all lands who are demanding that all international problems be negotiated between the Great Powers. In the face of the Formosa action and any future actions in this direction, these hundreds of millions will be joined by new millions from all walks of life in every country in resistance to policies that threaten world peace and the vital interests of every people. The Congress of the Peoples for Peace held in December in Vienna expressed the great breadth of the opposition throughout the world to the policy of reliance on force in international affairs and the determination of all peoples to block the perspective of world war.

The American Peace Crusade has always held up the perspective of world peace through the settlement of differences between nations by negotiation. The National policy meeting must determine what steps must now be taken, in the light of these new developments at home and abroad, so that the American people can most effectively contribute to assuring the realization of the perspective of world peace.

In this connection, several questions suggest themselves for our consideration:

1. Have recent developments in foreign policy, especially in regard to Formosa, produced a heightened sense among any major sections of the American people that our foreign policy may stimulate the spread of war in Asia?
2. Have there been reactions to the speeches of Dulles and Eisenhower which could be considered as signs of a growing awareness that our foreign policy may lead to the outbreak of a world war?
3. Does the present foreign policy, as it is emerging since the inauguration, accurately reflect the wishes and desires of the majority of the people in the United States?
4. How will the consequences of the projected policies of the new Administration affect the interests of various sections of our national population? How can the peace movement guide reactions to these consequences into positive action for peace?
5. What consequences will this foreign policy have for peace in colonial areas, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean? How will such developments affect various sections of our population?
6. Are there currents and trends -- now existing or apt to appear in reaction to the consequences of the policies of the new Administration -- which would support alternatives to the present foreign policy?
7. Is there a possibility that out of these groupings and trends could come a series of peace actions and peace activities?

8. Is it possible that around specific issues, such as UMW, the draft of fathers and 19-year-olds, the increasing hardships to labor, Negroes and farmers, there could come united front and coalition activities drawing upon the strength of several such groupings? How should such coalition activities on specific issues be related to the central demands of the peace movement for Great Power negotiation, cease-fire in Korea, etc.?
9. What relationship can and should the American Peace Crusade and similar peace centers have to such developments?
10. If such peace centers can and should have a relationship to the stimulation of coalition peace actions, what improvements are necessary in their structure and functioning in order to make their role effective?
11. Does the American Peace Crusade have a responsibility to help bring to bear on the American situation the tremendous breadth and strength of the world peace movement? If so, how can the Crusade best acquaint the American people with the aims and character of the world peace movement?

These are some of the questions suggested by the political change occasioned by the inauguration of a new administration.

Without going into our estimate of the political questions around foreign policy, we would like to indicate our thinking with regard to the possibilities of developing coalition peace activities and actions during the coming period. It is our belief that such activities can and must be developed. Moreover, we are convinced that these activities will take any number of different forms. On the basis of some developments since last November, we believe that it is possible for greater discussions of an informal nature at this time with leaders who represent many of the various grouping and trends for peaceful alternatives to the present foreign policy.

It is our belief that an efficiently functioning American Peace Crusade can and must play an important role in the development during the coming period. Moreover, we are convinced that many of the old methods of work which have characterized the APC during the past must be discarded. In this connection, a number of corrective steps are already under way and others will be taken on the basis of consultation with the Sponsors and local peace leaders throughout the nation. Examination reveals that the supporters of APC constitute themselves a coalition of a certain character. The APC thus has the specific responsibility, therefore, to conduct its work in such a way as to fully reflect and utilize the coalition strength which is already present. Proper utilization of this strength can go far towards the development of new projects, new steps for the achievement of an ever widening APC coalition.

Of particular importance is the need for us to come forward with the creative ideas with reference to extending our relationship with the organized labor movement, the movement of the Negro people and the farm movements.

Even 100% achievement of these tasks would not be sufficient to bring about a new and peaceful foreign policy. We in the APC are convinced that above all it is necessary to stimulate the kind of peace activities that will bring forward the voices of thitherto unheard-from sections of the people.

The need for the creative techniques, utilizing developments in local, state and national legislatures, is indicated.

It is clear that there will be many peace developments and peace actions in which the APC will have no formal role. Nevertheless it will be of the utmost importance that we lend every possible support to every movement, action and activity which contributes to a greater expression for peace either directly or indirectly. Within this framework it will be necessary for the organization to make maximum use of its resources, increase its sources of financial support, increase its service to groups which depend upon it throughout the country.

that I could get movies and speakers through their organization, the American-Russian Institute.

Dr. Kingsbury had previously told me to make reports to the head of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, who was Richard Morford. He instructed me to report on the meetings we had here in San Diego to him. I did and afterwards received literature, information, I got several movies, I think, through their organization. They sent me a huge amount of literature, I know over a hundred dollars worth of literature, explaining that getting the money from the literature was not important, that the dissemination of the information was.

They were pro-Soviet magazines, pro-Soviet books I was sent. Reva Mucha in Los Angeles carried that out further. Their organization was putting out a little newspaper called the Digest of Soviet News. I was told that—first, Mrs. Mucha asked me to give her the names of people in the San Diego area that would be interested in receiving it. I said I didn't think it was correct. She said however she would send me about 50 copies of the paper each month and I couldn't distribute them down here. She said it was not necessary for us to get money for the newspapers, that as long as people like Corliss Lamont subscribed to it it wasn't necessary. She said he had just given a hundred dollars to keep the newspaper going that day.

MR. TAVENNER. I hand you two issues of the Digest of Soviet News to which you referred and ask you whether they were copies which you received from the American-Russian Institute.

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they were. It changed its format after that. I don't believe these are the ones they mailed me. I believe I received these previous to that. Many of them I received through the mail too, however.

MR. TAVENNER. I desire to have them identified and marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibits 9 and 10" (San Diego), Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be so marked and received.

MR. TAVENNER. So that by this time in 1953 you were making reports from the San Diego Peace Forum, if I understand your testimony correctly, to the American-Russian Institute—am I correct in that?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. That is correct. Dr. Kingsbury was particularly interested in making the peace forum an actual unit of the American-Russian Institute. I discussed it with Verna Langer at our Communist club meetings. She said San Diego was too small to use the name openly but that certainly we should use the facilities.

(Representative Walter left the hearing room.)

MR. TAVENNER. You were also making reports, if I understand your testimony correctly, to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir; the American-Russian Institute was the regional branch of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Then the San Diego Peace Forum became a local unit of that.

MR. TAVENNER. So this very high-sounding title "San Diego Peace Forum" has gotten to be a very broad organization, hasn't it?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it did. After that time we attempted to reorganize and revitalize it. I discussed it at my Communist club

meetings, with John and Dorothy Kykyri at that time. We decided that it would be, it could become an educational group for Communist Party members, that I could get educational movies through the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which were taken inside the Soviet Union, they had separate movies on each of the 16 Russian Republics that I could get very inexpensively and show them in San Diego in an attempt to educate the people. We should also furnish mimeograph sheets.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean Communist education?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, pardon me. We could also furnish mimeograph sheets with information on them. However, John and Dorothy Kykyri moved back to Los Angeles and were working with Reva Mucha in Los Angeles. It cost more money than the local Communist Party felt it could afford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you spoke of a program that was resorted to of using films that you obtained from other organizations, I believe you said some of them were Russian films.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. All of those that we could obtain from the National Council of American Soviet Friendship were taken inside the Soviet Union. We also rented one from the Southern California peace film center which was taken inside the Soviet Union. It was a Soygoto film, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did this group show any patriotic or historical movies of the development of our country, the United States?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, the only speakers we presented and the only movies we showed were completely pro-Soviet and pro-Communist ones.

Never in all that length of time did we present even a speaker that could be called a broad speaker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that all part of the activity of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the ultimate result of the showing of the movies? Was it looked upon with satisfaction by the functionaries of the Communist Party here ultimately, or not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We didn't show very many movies in the peace forum itself. That was a substitute for Hugh Hardyman on the occasion I have already told you about. However, we did set up a separate group, San Diego film club, little theater film club it was, to show movies after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party continue with that program or stop it for any reason?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Communist Party stopped showing the Little Theater Film Club because we were showing films one night each week and I was told the Communist Party members were using that as a substitute for Communist Party activity. They would go look at the films and go home and feel they had done a good job and neglect their Communist Party work.

As a result of it, and although the other party members seemed to like it very much, it was discontinued.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have a few minutes break at this time?

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will stand in recess.

(Brief recess.)

(Representative Walter returned to the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Raise your right hand, please. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GUE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY M. GUE

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. GUE. Stanley M. Gue.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell your name, please.

Mr. GUE. G-u-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gue, you were requested by the chairman of the committee to appear here today, I believe.

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive a letter to that effect?

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice from the copy of the chairman's letter the following statement:

This request is in no way to be construed as a reflection upon you but it is believed information you have regarding certain phases of the committee inquiry would be of material assistance.

So I want to make it clear at the outset that there is no feeling on the part of the staff or of the committee, or anything to indicate that your being called should be considered in any derogatory character whatsoever.

Mr. GUE. Thank you very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Gue?

Mr. GUE. I was born in Saginaw, Mich., May 10, 1892.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in California?

Mr. GUE. Yes; I have since 1907, I have lived in San Diego most of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. GUE. I am employed by the State of California as Deputy State Labor Commissioner and have been for the past 32 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. GUE. I graduated from grammar school and took one year of high school in Michigan, with Latin and algebra, and have studied law in the San Diego Evening High School for a time here and maintained home studies and have a degree of bachelor of laws.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been active and interested in the field of religion?

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an organization in San Diego County or City known as the Community Unitarian Fellowship?

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at one time affiliated with it?

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. First of all we would like to understand whether or not it is a part of the Unitarian Church or any Unitarian Church organization?

Mr. GUE. No, it is not a part of the Unitarian Church in San Diego. That is a separate institution which organized here I think in 1872 and has been in existence, and this fellowship has no connection with the First Unitarian Church and it is not officially recognized as a Unitarian organization by the American Unitarian Association, the headquarters or the parent body of the Unitarian Churches in America.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it seek such recognition by the American Unitarian Association?

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it given such recognition?

Mr. GUE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first become associated with it?

Mr. GUE. The fellowship as such was organized in 1953, in April or May 1953, and a charter as a corporation, a nonprofit corporation, was secured a few months after that from the State of California as a nonprofit corporation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your interest in the organization?

Mr. GUE. Well, my interest was that of promoting a religious organization. I had hoped and I had great ideals and visions of a new Unitarian Church in San Diego, a second Unitarian Church. I had commenced a study of religion and had planned to take a course in the Unitarian School for the ministry at Berkeley, perhaps a correspondence course and later enter the ministry myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were the president of this organization when its charter was issued.

Mr. GUE. Yes, sir; I was elected as the first president in the year 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, in your own way what occurred in this organization to disturb you and ultimately lead to your separation from it?

Mr. GUE. Well, things seemed to go along fairly well, there were some disagreements, but of course we live in a world of disagreement, we can't all believe alike. My beliefs were theistic in nature and some of the members were nontheistic, I think perhaps 1 or 2 atheistic, but they were members of the fellowship as I understand, for the ethical and moral values that they obtained from it, from our services. I was in charge from the inception of the fellowship, I was in charge of the religious services. I was sort of acting as an ex officio minister although we had other speakers. I tried to invite other ministers and people interested in religious subjects to talk for us.

It was my hope that we would have other Unitarian ministers speak regularly for us. But after a year or so, well, perhaps 2 years, almost 2 years, there seemed to be a little change in the tone of the organization and when I was conducting the services I had recited a prayer and readings, various religious and ethical readings and I detected on the part of some a disagreement with that policy, and my effort to inject a spiritual tone in the services.

The national association even noticed a change in one of the bulletins that were issued and wrote me a letter wanting to know some-

thing about it. I have the letter here from the director of the fellowship division of the National Unitarian Association.

The abrupt change that took place occurred during the time last year that I was on my vacation and my wife and I went back East on a trip; we visited the American Unitarian Association headquarters in Boston and some of the Unitarian churches.

The CHAIRMAN. What is American Unitarian Association comprised of?

Mr. GUE. I didn't get your question.

The CHAIRMAN. How has that been constituted?

Mr. GUE. That is the parent organization of the Unitarian churches in America. It was organized, I don't know how many years ago, I think more than a hundred years ago; I had the date here some place; and it is an association of all Unitarian churches and fellowships that are recognized by that organization.

It is the central body, parent body, of the Unitarian churches in America.

The CHAIRMAN. That isn't in response to my question. My question is, How was that constituted? Who selected that organization?

Mr. GUE. Well, the Unitarian churches organized the American Unitarian Association, I think, around 1830, I believe, approximately that date.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it governed by a board?

Mr. GUE. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who selects the board?

Mr. GUE. The delegates from the churches meet in an annual meeting, much the same as other churches. They meet every May in Boston and have an annual meeting and all the churches are invited to send delegates.

The CHAIRMAN. Has that governing board any jurisdiction over activities of member churches?

Mr. GUE. Oh, yes. The governing board, board of directors, have general supervision over the activities of the Unitarian churches and all of the various departments, religious schools, the fellowship department, and which is—the fellowships are beginning organizations, before they attain the status of churches, board of directors handles the business affairs of the church and has general supervision over the policies, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. If one of the ministers in this faith should depart from being a "liberal," something more, would the parent body have any jurisdiction to censure him or remove him?

Mr. GUE. I don't think so. The Unitarian churches are congregational in nature; they are democratic in their actions. Each church selects its own ministers and directors and so long as they adhere in general to the Unitarian religion, the national board of directors does not interfere with them.

The CHAIRMAN. So that a minister could adhere technically and at the same time preach concepts that are outside of religion?

Mr. GUE. I don't know about that. I think that any minister who departs from the essential teachings of the Unitarian Church would not be given recognition either as a minister or perhaps the church would not be given recognition. I think that is a matter within the scope of the annual meetings and the board of directors. I have here a little pamphlet issued by the American Unitarian Associa-

tion which states the Unitarian objectives and the working principles which might be interesting to the committee to put in the files, which will explain the principles of the Unitarian Church and its religion.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were proceeding to tell the committee in your own way what occurred in this organization which resulted in your suspecting some improper motives and which ultimately led to the termination of your relationship with it.

Mr. GUE. I can only speak for myself, of course, and my feelings.

As I stated, I went into this fellowship as a religious venture to express my religious ideals and develop my spirituality and try to help others in the fellowship and those who might become members along the same lines.

When my wife and I—my wife, incidentally, is a communicant in the Episcopal Church, although she attended the fellowship meetings with me. My wife and I went on our vacation and were gone 6 weeks, last September and October. When I came back I found that our board of trustees had made some changes in the setup in the fellowship and they had appointed Dr. Harry Steinmetz as chairman of the program committee.

I had been acting as such up to that time. I had been arranging most of the programs, although not all of them, getting most of the speakers. We had a program committee, the members of which were supposed to get speakers, and they did. But when I came back I found that the program committee had been, as I understood, reorganized, and that the speakers would be arranged by one of our members, Dr. Harry Steinmetz, and I found that our trustees in my absence had determined to cut down on the number of religious readings in the service and to shorten up on the songs, and there seemed to be quite a few changes.

The editorship of our bulletin had been taken over by Mr. Steinmetz, and as a matter of fact, it was my impression, whether rightly or wrongly, that Mr. Steinmetz was taking over the management of this fellowship. I frankly was very much disappointed and disturbed, and shortly afterward I received a letter without any communication from me from our national fellowship director in which he said:

It could be my imagination, but it seems to me there is a different tenor in your newsletters recently. It seems to me the tone is one of analysis only, excluding synthesis. I have come to believe that attacking any evil is a good thing, but any liberal worth his salt will have some suggestion as to how to replace the evil with the good.

I had been trying to stress the positive attitude on life and there seemed to be an attitude on Dr. Steinmetz' part of just attacking things he considered evil and without, as Mr. Monroe Husbands, the director, stated, without trying to supplant those evil things with some positive aspect or some positive program.

So this came as rather a surprise to me, this comment from the national headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. GUE. January 5, 1955. It came to me without any comment or report from me to national headquarters, although I had been disturbed ever since I came back from my vacation and I found that

things were rather apparently taken out of my hands and up to that time I had been called in a very friendly way by I think the majority of the members as our minister and our bishop and various other things.

It made me feel good. Then I found that there seemed to be a difference of attitude, that instead of purely religious services that there seemed to be a desire to have discussion subjects instead of a purely religious meeting and more or less propaganda meetings.

The thing came to a head, so far as I was concerned, in January when the program committee arranged, I didn't have anything to do with it, I didn't arrange the programs at that time, arranged for Harry F. Ward to come here and speak. I didn't know Ward. I had heard of him as a Methodist minister for many years, head of the Methodist Federation for Social Service. I had always thought he was a very great minister. He came and spoke to us one Sunday morning and his talk in my opinion, as I so stated to our board of trustees afterward, was frankly shocking to me. It seemed to me that his whole argument was praising Russia and condemning the United States and I felt the need to get up and more or less apologize for what he said to our audience.

I told the audience that the Unitarians believe in free speech and freedom of thought, but in the last analysis, we are a religious organization and our fellowship was organized to be a religious organization. I was severely criticized for making those statements by Dr. Steinmetz and some of our members.

They said that I had insulted the speaker and his wife right to their faces, that I had no right to get up and criticize and so on.

So I told the vice president, Mr. Roper, that I felt the time had arrived when we should have a meeting of our trustees to determine what the policy should be.

I asked Mr. Roper as vice president to call the meeting, that I felt that if we were going to have meetings of that sort and speakers of that sort that we were going away, we were departing from the religious principles on which our fellowship was founded, and on which we had planned, at least I had planned to build and organize a new Unitarian Church, a second Unitarian Church in San Diego.

The meeting was held at Mr. Roper's house and Mr. Steinmetz stated that he believed that all of the arrangements and conduct of the services Sunday mornings should be taken out of my hands and placed in the hands of his committee, that the committee should rotate in conducting the Sunday morning services.

There were some other remarks such as he felt that the services should be more on general topics and varied topics as I had tried to concentrate on. So I told them if that is what they wanted that was a democratic organization, they could have it, and after the next meeting or the second meeting, the end of January anyway, I announced to the congregation that I was resigning and that that would be my last Sunday, and I haven't been back since.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether at this trustees' meeting there were persons present other than the board of trustees who participated in the voting?

Mr. GUE. Oh, yes. One of our members, one of Dr. Steinmetz' close friends had called up a number of his friends and asked them to be at

the meeting and after Dr. Steinmetz had stated how he thought the services should be conducted the vice president, Mr. Roper, polled all of the people present and they all voted that they were in favor of Dr. Steinmetz' program. So I felt my services in that organization were no longer of any use to myself or to the organization.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. You have mentioned one speaker, Dr. Harry Ward. Do you recall the names of any of the other speakers who were brought here by your successor?

Mr. GUE. The January bulletin gave a list of a number of the speakers.

Mr. JACKSON. If it is not readily available, and if they can be given to the staff later on for our information, I would appreciate it.

Mr. GUE. Here is a bulletin, I think this is it. January 2, Alvin R. Leonard, assistant director of public health of the city of San Diego. Incidentally, Mr. Leonard made a very fine talk and it was on the public health services of the city of San Diego and while it wasn't a religious talk I think it was of very great value.

Listed here on January 9, Prof. Bernard Kirby, State College sociologist who spoke on social ills and cures.

January 16, Dr. Harry F. Ward, of New York.

January 23, Prof. Ned Joy, State College political scientist, who spoke on the United States of America and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, a study in power or powers.

I didn't find any fault with that at all, though the topic didn't appear to me to be a proper topic for religious services, nothing of a religious tone.

The CHAIRMAN. Your group didn't realize it but this is the insidious practice of softening you up for something else.

Mr. GUE. Frankly, I just came to realize that I was more or less of a front for something else and I didn't propose to be used as a front for anybody or anything because I have lived all my life as an honorable American citizen, I have had my sons in the Army and in the Air Force; one of them was killed in the last war. I tried to be a good American and I just felt at the end that I was simply being more or less used. I just didn't think that I wanted to do anything of that kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you when the charter of the corporation was obtained, whether you were required to comply with the law of the State of California regarding the loyalty oath.

Mr. GUE. Oh, yes. Before any charter I understand that is issued, in fact I received a letter which should be in the files of the fellowship, I don't have the letter myself, I received a letter from either the Secretary of State or somebody in the State Department saying that before the charter could be issued it had to be cleared with some tax department of the State, I don't know whether it was the franchise tax commissioner or the corporation commissioner, and they sent me a form of oath to sign as the president of this organization, this corporation, stating that this Community Unitarian Fellowship was not organized for the purpose of overthrowing of the government of the State of California or the Government of the United States by force or violence. I was very glad to sign it. I certainly so far as I was concerned, our Community Unitarian Fellowship was not organized

for any such purpose. It was organized as a genuine, bona fide religious organization, an organization of the highest spiritual ideals.

I since, without consulting anyone else, I thought it was within my province to sign that oath as president, I signed it and sent it back and the charter was thereafter issued by the Secretary of State as a corporation.

I said nothing at the time to the board of trustees nor any of the officers or members. Sometime afterward, however, several months I think afterward, I mentioned that I had signed this oath. It was during a discussion of the enactment of some of these bills that were being challenged by a number of the churches in California, the requirement of churches to sign this oath in order to secure the benefit of tax exemption which under the Constitution I believe all churches are entitled to.

I mentioned that I had signed this oath, I thought it was entirely proper, and I was very much surprised to find that I was criticized by some of the officers and members of the board for my action in signing that oath.

They said I hadn't been authorized by anybody to sign it and I did think very seriously of writing in to the Secretary of State and telling him that I had signed it without consulting with the other officers and that I had been criticized and perhaps I should withdraw my signature.

I haven't done so yet, but I didn't feel exactly at ease about the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be the proper thing to do. It would be interesting to see if anybody else would be willing after official action to sign such an oath.

Mr. GUE. Since I have been criticized for signing the oath and was told I had no authority to sign it, perhaps I was not acting for the fellowship. I thought I was and I signed it sincerely. I have signed a lot of them. I have signed several of them as a State employee, and I signed them honestly and sincerely and I saw no reason why I shouldn't sign this.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, in light of the testimony already developed by this witness which shows that this fellowship, degenerated into a creature of the Communist Party, it would be advisable for the witness to so inform the Secretary of State or the other cognizant officer that he is no longer affiliated with it.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't want to presume to advise him, but I certainly think that is advisable.

Mr. GUE. I haven't heard any such testimony and I want to say in fairness to the members of our fellowship I think most of the members are very good, honest citizens.

Mr. JACKSON. I cast no reflection on them.

Mr. GUE. I think the fellowship—of those members perhaps now those who have remained—a lot of them have quit.

Mr. JACKSON. I say that in light of the testimony of the witness preceding you on the stand. I am sorry you were not in the hearing room.

Mr. GUE. I heard no discussion of communism in the fellowship meetings at any time; in fact, I don't think the word "communism" was mentioned excepting at one Sunday morning service where there was something said by one speaker about communism—I don't know

just what it was—but I made the statement to those there that I personally was anti-Communist, I didn't believe in it. That is the only discussion, only time the word "Communist" I think was ever uttered at our meetings so far as I know, and I am sure that most of our members, most of the fellowship members were not in any way disloyal or subversive in any respect.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course that is the tragedy of organizing people who do not scrutinize sufficiently the individuals or the motives of the individuals who are in many cases the most vociferous members of a group such as this. I would certainly suggest that when the transcript of this hearing is printed that you determine what a previous witness had to say about this fellowship from the standpoint of the Communist Party.

Mr. GUE. I know nothing about that.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that you will be surprised to learn the nature of the interest of the Communist Party in that organization and the things that were done to insure that the Communist Party would exercise control of the group.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I assume from my experience in incorporating nonprofit corporations that the members of the group who said that you were not acting with the authority of the corporation, were the first board of directors named in the articles of incorporation? Is that correct?

Mr. GUE. Some of them, not the first board; this came several months later. I never said anything about it for several months.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they pass a resolution in the minutes showing you had no authority?

Mr. GUE. No, it was just personal criticisms by some of the members of the board at that time. This was several months later.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, if I were in that position when I wrote the Secretary of State, if I did, I would give him notice that the individuals who were members of the board who claimed I had no authority to sign on behalf of the corporation, so that the public record at Sacramento will show that you were withdrawing, if you do that, and who the members of the board were and then let the record from there on speak for itself. Just the individual members of the board, as long as the board didn't criticize you by official action of the board, that it was an individual position.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you said that official recognition of the Community Unitarian Fellowship was not given by the parent organization or the head, the national organization of your church.

Mr. GUE. That is right. That was because of a protest which was sent in by Rev. Peter Samson, minister of the First Unitarian Church, and the board of directors of the First Unitarian Church. They sent a protest in objecting to any recognition by the Unitarian movement of the fellowship. I had never seen the protest and I haven't seen it to date, but I have been informed by the national officers that a protest was sent in and that there have been subsequent protests sent in by the minister and as a result the board has just put our application for recognition as a formal Unitarian fellowship, they put it in the pending file and they have had several committees working on rules for admission of fellowships.

Apparently they never had any definite results for admission of fellowships. They just grew like Topsy. There has been a very great increase in membership in the Unitarian Church in the United States in the last 3 or 4 years. They said they were just going to work out some rules for admission and that was reason or excuse, I guess, for not granting us formal recognition.

I had hoped that eventually we would be recognized, I had hoped that we would have the blessing of the First Unitarian Church, I had maintained my friendly relations with the members of the First Unitarian Church and with Mr. Samson. He and I had always been very close friends. In fact, Mr. Samson told me a long time ago I was just being used as a front. He said, "You are perfectly sincere; you don't realize it." I ridiculed it, I told him he didn't know what he was talking about, that our members were all sincere devoted Unitarians. He may still be wrong for all I know. I don't know. I would like to see the fellowship grow into a real religious organization, a real Unitarian organization. I have no ill feelings toward the members of that organization. In fact, my last words to them were "God bless you all," and really believe—

MR. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I would think any group of American citizens that puts a soft pedal on prayer and praise of God doesn't stand much chance of turning into a religious organization.

MR. GUE. That is what my wife told me. My wife used to sit in the back and she told me after this came up that several of the more prominent people in the fellowship who used to sneer at my prayers and my religious expressions, that they used to sneer at it, and my wife said she didn't want to tell me at the time because she didn't want to hurt my feelings. She resigned from membership before I did.

THE CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER. Then the official position of the Unitarian Church in San Diego was one of opposition to the recognition of this group?

MR. GUE. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. And it had been necessary for the Unitarian Church here to prevent this group at an earlier period when it was under the sponsorship of the San Diego Peace Forum from holding its forum meetings in the church?

MR. GUE. So far as I know, the San Diego Peace Forum had never sponsored our former organization, which was known then as the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. So far as I know the Peace Forum had nothing to with it. I never attended any of the meetings of the Peace Forum. They were held originally in the Unitarian Church until the board of directors told them that they could not meet there any more. I didn't know who was at the head of the Peace Forum and, so far as I know, they had no connection with our Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

MR. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Gue, your testimony has been illuminating and of great value. It is obvious to me that you are a typical, honest, God-fearing American, who wouldn't recognize a conspiracy if it came into a room and took the seat next to you. When this hearing is completed I am sure that you will be shocked to learn all of the facts of

what transpired in the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice here in San Diego.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gue, I too want to thank you for coming here. You have given to the people of this community a very striking example of the purpose Congress had in mind when this committee was created. The great majority of the American people are God-fearing, patriotic, hard-working people interested in preserving our ideals as anybody else, but as Congressman Jackson has so well put it, they wouldn't recognize this conspiracy if they fell over it.

That is why it is so important that people of your sort, to come forward and let their neighbors know what happened. We know. We have seen this from one end of the United States to the other. But your neighbors haven't. They are unsuspecting. And you have made a very fine contribution to the education of the fine people in this community and I thank you.

The committee will stand adjourned now, to meet at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m. the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—JULY 5, 1955

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that Congressman Jackson and the chairman are present.

Mr. TAVENNER, will you call your next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mrs. Anita Schneider.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Schneider.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, I would like to return now to a further discussion and inquiry into the activities of the San Diego Peace Forum.

You have told us what part the Communist Party played in securing certain speakers. What other activities did the San Diego Peace Forum engage in besides having discussion groups with the invited speakers?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The San Diego Peace Forum was primarily an educational institution. It furnished speakers, it collected signatures on petitions, and circulated leaflets.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of leaflets did it circulate?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Pro-Soviet leaflets completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that many of these leaflets were of a pro-Soviet character. Where did you obtain these leaflets?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The leaflets we obtained were from the Southern California Peace Crusade. Most of them came from the American Peace Crusade originally.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a paper entitled "The Peace Reporter," published by the American Peace Crusade, and I will ask you if this is one of the documents which you received.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; it is.

Another is Peace Notes. Peace Notes, I think, were put out by the Southern California Peace Crusade.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to have this document identified by this witness and marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 11." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a pamphlet entitled "How to Protect Yourself From the Atom Bomb," by Robert Freedman, and I will ask you if that was one of the documents you received for distribution.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This is one of the documents I received, but I received this from the Communist Party for distribution at the Peace Forum meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say you received it from the Communist Party, what group in the Communist Party did you receive it from?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. From my Communist club meetings. I remember Verna Langer's being there. I think I remember Celia Shermis as being there, but I am not positive about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to have the document marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 12." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you directed at this Communist Party meeting to use this document in the San Diego Peace Forum work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; we were. I didn't have time to read the pamphlet.

We were also directed to give it to the other people in our community, including the ministers of churches.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a postal card and ask you to identify it, please, and state what it is.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This is a postcard asking President Eisenhower to keep our boys out of Indochina. It was put out, of course, to try to prevent a major Indochina war from beginning.

I don't know whether it was originally put out by the American Peace Crusade or not. I believe I got it in Los Angeles from the Southern California Peace Crusade.

Mr. TAVENNER. May it be marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 13." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a series of leaflets and will ask you to describe in a general way what they are, please.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The first is a copy of the Peace Reporter from the American Peace Crusade. These were mailed as a rule directly to us from the American Peace Crusade as head of the units of the peace organization.

The second is a Call to Protect the Peace, urging the people to write to President Eisenhower. This was put out by the New York Peace Council.

The next is Recommendations for the Campaign of Peace Action for the Korean Truce. I can't remember the exact date on it. I believe it was put out just after the end of the Korean war and before the truce agreement was drawn up. It came from the Southern California Peace Crusade, I believe, but originally from the American Peace Crusade.

The next is Greetings for Peace, a petition. I believe we had one of these before. It was put out by the American Peace Crusade. It had wide distribution all over the country.

The next are peace stamps. We were sold the peace stamps and urged to put them on envelopes whenever we wrote or mailed Christ-

mas cards and things of that sort. They thought they might do the post office employees some good that way.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to have them marked for identification only as one group of documents and designated "Schneider Exhibit No. 14." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you now a group of pamphlets. I will ask you to identify them and state where you got them.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The top is We Saw for Ourselves, a report of the 19 Americans on their visit to the U. S. S. R. I received that through the Communist Party.

The second is the American Way to Jobs, Peace and Democracy. I received that through the Communist Party also.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you there, please.

Was any use made of those documents in the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The booklet, We Saw for Ourselves, was used.

The booklet on the atom bomb was used.

The book on the American Way to Jobs, Peace and Democracy was not used in the Peace Forum. It was used for our own education as leaders of the peace movement.

The Search for Peace, by D. N. Pritt, put out by International Publishers, was sold to me by the Communist Party also.

Mr. TAVENNER. What use was made of it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Education of the peace leaders, I believe. There was a fairly strict division of booklets that were useful in the Peace Forum for mass sales, and booklets that were just usable by ourselves as leaders in the peace movement or by just executive board members who could be trusted. This one actually refers to the Communist Party, so it wouldn't have been good to sell it at Peace Forum meetings.

Next is Spain and Peace by Howard Fast. It was sold at Peace Forum meetings.

Next is the Educational System of the Soviet Union, written by Elizabeth Moos, who was one of our speakers in San Diego. That was sold by the San Diego Peace Forum. It was sold by the Communist Party but these copies, I believe, were obtained through the Peace Forum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Let me ask you a few questions about Elizabeth Moos.

Did you know her personally?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did. She was my house guest for about a week, I believe, and I met her on several occasions in Los Angeles also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn from her what her relationship to William Walter Remington was?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did. William Remington was Elizabeth Moos's son-in-law. She was in disgrace at the time she stayed at my home. The Communist Party criticized her, I don't know the details of the Remington case, but the Communist Party said that if she had kept a closer family relationship with William Remington and with her daughter, that testimony that one of them gave would never have been given. She was supposed to keep tabs on her family.

Mr. TAVENNER. She was criticized then for not keeping a more strict control over her family?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she criticized within the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They looked on her as being responsible for the testimony given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, you will probably recall that this committee, through its investigation, discovered the Communist Party membership of Remington as a result of which he was called before a grand jury and finally prosecuted for perjury, not perjury before our committee but perjury before the grand jury.

It was about that time that the committee started its investigation into these peace movements and discovered that the post office address to which petitions should be filed in New York City was her address, Elizabeth Moos.

Now, proceed, if you will.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The last leaflet is We Came, We Saw, and We Report, statements of a delegation to the U. S. S. R., put out by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This was one of the many leaflets that the national council sent to the San Diego Peace Forum for sale and distribution.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to have the documents marked for identification only as one batch of documents and designated "Schneider Exhibit No. 15." (San Diego)

The CHAIRMAN. They will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another document and ask you to state what it is, please.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This document is a catalog put out by the Southern California Peace Crusade, advertising the peace film center. It outlines the film that can be arranged from the Southern California Peace Crusade. It was sent to all of the peace groups in the Southern California Peace Crusade.

Mr. TAVENNER. May the document be marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 16." (San Diego)

(At this point, Representative Doyle entered the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you say it came from?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. From the Southern California Peace Crusade.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, what was the source of the mailing list used by the San Diego Peace Forum to mail out the various items of propaganda which you received?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The original mailing list was given to me when I was elected chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum by Arthur Stevens and Lloyd Hamlin. When we activated the Peace Forum and really worked on it, we also added all of the other progressive mailing lists in the town. We added the IPP mailing list, we added the Unitarian Fellowships—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state what IPP means please—

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Independent Progressive Party mailing list. We added also the Civil Rights Congress mailing list, we added the Unitarian Fellowship mailing list, the Communist Party mailing list. Also, a few ministers were thrown in and a few innocent lawyers.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the Communist Party had access to the mailing lists of all of these front organizations?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And they were utilized in the San Diego Peace Forum work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. In fact, there was even a closer relationship. We would borrow the addressograph machine from the Unitarian Fellowship, we always mimeographed at the Independent Progressive Party office, and on their mimeograph machines.

One of the leaflets was addressed at the Unitarian Fellowship, but the envelopes were addressed there.

Sometimes we had a few Peace Forum members in on the mailing but not too often. Much of the work was done by the Communist Party itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that you had the free run of the community Unitarian Fellowship, the Independent Progressive Party headquarters, and the San Diego Peace Forum headquarters to carry out the propaganda work of the Communist Party—

The CHAIRMAN. She added something more. She said much of the work was done by the Communist Party.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, that is true. The nonprogressives, non-Communist Party members, were never quite as helpful about running the mimeograph machines, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. To boil this down, much of the information came from the Communist Party and was disseminated largely by members of the Communist Party.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any occasions on which you had difficulty carrying out Communist Party directives when working as chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum? I mean from the standpoint of opposition from members of that group who were not members of the Communist Party.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they found that my actions as chairman of the group were very inconsistent. We would have executive board meetings, make decisions, I would start to carry them out and, after a Communist Party Club meeting, have to change them. They found it very unbelievable.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the Communist Party would reverse decisions made by the legitimate organization of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they would. In the end, I gave up trying to follow the executive board directions at all. I merely carried out the directions of the Communist Party; the non-Communist members on the Peace Forum executive board naturally dropped out.

Mr. DOYLE. What is the status of the San Diego Peace Forum now? You said you were still chairman as far as you knew.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. After the Korean war, when the policy of the American Peace Crusade was changed, putting us into the other organizations, it became quite inactive. We did have one meeting, I think, last December, just sort of an accident. There wasn't anyone else to sponsor it, we had a good speaker, so we had a Peace Forum meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned in the early part of your testimony a person by the name of Isobel Cerney.

What is the correct pronunciation?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Isobel Cerney.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was Isobel Cerney from?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Isobel Cerney is from San Francisco. She is a former teacher who was thrown out of the public school system because of her Communist Party activity. Her husband, at least last November, was a teacher in the California Labor School. She was a candidate for United States Senate on the Independent Progressive Party ticket in November.

Mr. TAVENNER. From the San Francisco area?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That would be statewide.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say for the Senate?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to see her in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did; on one occasion she was a speaker for the San Diego Peace Forum, one or more occasions, I don't remember which. She also came as a candidate for office from the Independent Progressive Party in May before the primary elections, I believe, and then again in November.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Peter Hyun have anything to do with her appearance here in San Diego in connection with the San Diego Peace Forum work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was he that arranged the speaking for us.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a letter on the stationery of Southern California Peace Crusade bearing date of May 22, 1953, signed Minna K. Beilew, it appears. Do you recall the name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I remember the woman. I am not positive about the name, either.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the letter, please.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. She was acting secretary in the Southern California Peace Crusade office.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom is the letter addressed?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It is addressed to me and tells about the possibility of getting Mrs. Cerney to have a meeting in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive this letter?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Schneider Exhibit No. 17."

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be received.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to read one paragraph from the letter:

It is possible that you discussed this with Peter, but he is out of the office, ill, and I don't have the results of your talk with him. So please write me at once and give me the answers so I can phone Mrs. Cerney on Monday.

Now, that related to the making of an appointment to speak here in San Diego, did it not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I now hand you a copy of a letter bearing date of May 20, the year is not stated, addressed to Mrs. Virgil A. Schneider. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not you received the original of that letter, and, if so, from whom it was sent.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, this letter was sent to me from Isobel Cerney. She was making arrangements for a speaking appearance in San Diego. I don't remember the year on this, but whatever year Sunday came on May 24 would be correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I call to your attention the fact that the letter from Peter Hyun's office was May 22, 1953.

SCHNEIDER EXHIBIT No. 17 (SAN DIEGO)

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PEACE CRUSADE

ROOM 210 • 226 WEST 2ND STREET • LOS ANGELES 13, CALIFORNIA

MUTUAL 1293

May 22, 1953.

Dear Mrs. Schneider;

Mrs. Isobel Cerney phoned yesterday, as soon as she arrived in Los Angeles and we told her about her engagement in your city on May 28th.

Mrs. Cerney asks about transportation. Will any of your friends be in L.A. at that time to drive her down, or will you be willing to pay her fare there and back on public transportation? Have you given any thought to her staying overnight?

It is possible that you discussed this with Peter, but he is out of the office, ill, and I don't have the results of your talk with him. So please write me at once and give me the answers so I can phone Mrs. Cerney on Monday.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Minna H. Berlow

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Then this would have been in 1953 also.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the date on that letter?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. After May 20, it says. This is referring to the same meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce this copy of a letter from Isobel N. Cerney in evidence and ask that it be marked "Schneider Exhibit No. 18" (San Diego) for identification only.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be received.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to read into evidence one paragraph:

My husband and I spent 6 weeks in the German Democratic Republic, 2 weeks in the Soviet Union (Moscow and Soviet Armenia) and 8 weeks in China between last July and mid-December. You will find articles of ours in the February, March and May issues of the New World Review with appropriate biographical material. "Asia Wants Peace" is a talk I give reporting on the Peking peace conference in which I try to show the achievements of the historic conference and to make the people understand some of the political, economic, and social realities of Asia in line with the Asian section of the Quaker report, Steps to Peace.

My Trip to China centers on answering such questions as "What is going on in China today?" "What are the schools, parents and youth organizations teaching the youth of China?" "Can we have peace and trade with China?" and so forth.

American Teacher in the Soviet Union centers on what I learned about the implications of their new 10-year plan for teachers and youth-guidance people in visits with deputies, people in the ministry of education, youth centers, schools, and so forth, in Moscow and Armenia.

Now, as a result, did Isobel Cerney appear as a speaker in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that she spoke here on observations of hers at the so-called Peking peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she did. Her entire talk, I believe, was based on China and her trip to the new Chinese Republic.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the hearings last week in Los Angeles, testimony was introduced indicating that the so-called Peking peace conference was held October 2 to October 10, 1952.

Do you recall whether or not, in the address that she gave here, that Mrs. Cerney made mention of bacteria warfare in any respect?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general character of her statements regarding bacteria warfare or what were her actual words, if you can recall?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We just assumed that we accepted the fact that the United States had used bacteriological warfare. She described the apparatus used in dropping it, according to the Communist propaganda, a cylinderlike affair that broke open after landing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you prior to this time been addressed here in San Diego by Hugh Hardyman on his report concerning the same conference? Had he spoken here, do you know?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He had spoken in San Diego. That was one of the meetings that brought on a violent disagreement between the regional Communist Party and the local Communist Party.

Peter Hyun had arranged for Hugh Hardyman to speak at both the Unitarian Fellowship and the peace forum.

Verna Langer thought that was very incorrect and sent me to Los Angeles to tell Peter Hyun that Hugh Hardyman couldn't speak for both groups and to cancel his appearance before the San Diego Peace Forum. He was replaced by the Soviet film Majordski from the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend Hugh Hardyman's presentation of his report?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, I didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. A document was introduced in evidence in Los Angeles in pamphlet form entitled "Report From China," by Hugh Hardyman, and on the back of the cover it was stated that additional

copies could be obtained from the Southern California Peace Crusade, price 10 cents.

Do you have any knowledge of the financing by the Southern California Peace Crusade of any of this material relating to the so-called peace conference in Peking, China?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not that I can recall at the moment.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I do remember seeing the document. We sold it, if I am not mistaken, at our peace-forum meetings. We were all disappointed in not having Hugh Hardyman speak for the peace forum.

Mr. JACKSON. But he did speak at the Unitarian Fellowship meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know the exact sponsorship of that meeting. He spoke with Dr. Steinmetz' group. I am not aware of whether it was a meeting at Dr. Steinmetz' home or a Unitarian Fellowship group.

The CHAIRMAN. When did this woman make the speech about the use of germ warfare?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. About May 1953, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember who attended the meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. If I am recalling the exact meeting, the meeting was originally scheduled at the Native Sons Hall and, through an error, we were not able to get the hall. The meeting was moved to the Independent Progressive Party Office. I can remember Arthur Stevens being present, of course, Mrs. Cerney, I think Leo Lueb. I would have to go through my address book. I can do that if you like.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it covered by any of the local newspapers?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No. The local newspapers were very good about refusing to print Communist Party news.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish that were true all over the Nation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with any other persons who attended this so-called Peking peace conference in China in October 1952?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Dr. John Kingsbury had attended the preliminary planning session of it. Isobel Cerney, and I did meet Hugh Hardyman in Los Angeles. He attended the Peking peace conference. I can't recall any others.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know that Dr. John Kingsbury, attended a preliminary meeting of the so-called peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He was very apologetic. We had sent out the notices for the peace forum meeting at which he was to speak, saying he had attended the Peking peace conference. He corrected me and said that he would try not to mention it on purpose, but the meeting he attended was the preliminary planning session. He had been sent to it by Jacques Duclos in France.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he tell you any of the circumstances under which he was sent by Jacques Duclos to attend this preliminary peace conference in China?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He said he was already in Nice and so had his passport, but that party members in the country were having difficulty obtaining passports to go to the conference. He said that then he was asked to go, since he already was abroad and had his passport.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he tell you how the expenses of that trip were met?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, he did. I was questioning him because we were contemplating my going to Stockholm at the same time. He said expenses would be no problem because they could be met in my case just the same as they were in his. Inside the Soviet Union someone, a young woman, was assigned to travel with him and show him over the Soviet Union. He would tell her a few things about his ideas, and so on, and she would write the story, they would publish it, and the money would be deposited to his account.

Exactly the same thing happened in China, except he expressed his pride in such a good story having come out of such a very small conference.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, there was a device by which Communist China and the Soviet Union paid the expenses of an American delegate to the so-called peace conference, or preliminary peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, as you were not present in Los Angeles, I probably should state for your information that an issue of the Daily People's World was introduced in evidence, in which it was reported that Dr. John Kingsbury, on being introduced to speak in California, was introduced by the statement that he was one of those who prepared the advance agenda of the so-called peace conference which was held in October.

The CHAIRMAN. Of what year? When was the peace conference held?

Mr. TAVENNER. October 2 to 10, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to mean that an American participated in the preparation of this phony peace movement?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the only evidence we had at Los Angeles was the newspaper account of his introduction, which stated that Dr. Kingsbury was one of those who helped prepare the advance agenda.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made that introduction?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be well to call Dr. Kingsbury to find out whether or not it is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. This witness testified Dr. Kingsbury told her substantially the same thing except in more detail.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, and in addition to calling Dr. Kingsbury, I would call as a witness before this committee everyone who went behind the Iron Curtain and made broadcastings, even intimating that this country was engaged in bacteriological warfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The person who made the statement here made the same statement which caused the court-martialing of American prisoners. I don't think that a civilian is any better than those soldiers. This is a shocking thing to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Isobel Cerney at any time advise you as to how she got to this peace conference in China?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mrs. Cerney didn't discuss that part of it with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't know how she obtained her passport?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not in her case. Mrs. Moos discussed getting my passport with me, as did Dr. Kingsbury.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that passport to the Stockholm peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any information regarding the circumstances under which Isobel Cerney received her appointment as a delegate to this so-called peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any information as to the circumstances under which Hugh Hardyman of Los Angeles was appointed as a delegate to this so-called peace conference?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I remember that the delegates were discussed. We were told that it was important to use delegates that were not well-known for their Communist Party activity or they would not be allowed to get passports by the State Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was that discussed?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At one of the peace workshops. I don't remember which one. Although we would like to have sent recognized Communist Party members, it was felt that sending other people was necessary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how the expenses of those who went as delegates to this so-called news conference were financed, other than what you have already told us?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know that.

Mr. JACKSON. How was it proposed that your expenses were to have been paid had you gone?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I didn't reach exactly that stage of discussion. Although Dr. Kingsbury did explain to me that my expenses while I was there would be covered. It was discussed in the Communist Party meeting locally. The people on the national level were disagreeing with the local Communist Party about delegates, for one thing.

The local Communist Party felt that Arthur Stevens should be the person to go, that enough money should be raised, while the national party was suggesting I should go from the peace forum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Go where?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. To the Stockholm peace conference.

The local Communist Party decided that we wouldn't be able to raise enough money locally to send a person anyway. It would cost probably \$1,200 or some such figure.

Mr. TAVENNER. We introduced in evidence in Los Angeles an issue of the Daily People's World which announced that on one occasion when Mr. Hugh Hardyman was being introduced as a speaker to make a report on his trip to China, he was introduced as the person whose trip to China was sponsored by the Southern California Peace Crusade.

Now, do you have any information on that subject, as to whether or not he was actually a person sponsored for this trip by the Southern California Peace Crusade.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I remember the delegate being discussed and the amount of money we would have to raise to send delegates to the peace conference.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the peace conference in China?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I can remember a southern California executive board meeting at which it was discussed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any actual knowledge that funds were raised for that purpose?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not that I can recall at this moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Aside from your activities in the San Diego Peace Forum, will you tell the committee, please, in just a general way what activities the Communist Party engaged in aside from its work in mass organizations? What did they do?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The major part of its work was done in the mass organizations. However, there were several meetings of people with speakers from the People's World that did take place locally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they arranged by the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I think they called themselves the Freedom of the Press Committee. It was the Communist Party that arranged it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we will probably discuss that subject a little later.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I can remember also some activity done in the Rosenberg case, by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would prefer to discuss that later.

Did the Communist Party as such engage in the dispersal of Communist Party propaganda and literature?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. There were several distributions of literature. There was a distribution on the Smith Act, I believe; there was a distribution on the Velde committee coming back to San Francisco, as I remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that this committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. They didn't agree with your committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have asked you to turn over to the staff some of the documents which you received from the Communist Party, or which the Communist Party disseminated in this area.

You have done so, haven't you?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you what was the source of this material?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Unless one or two pamphlets accidentally crept in, these were all obtained from the Communist Party in San Diego. The majority of them were from Verna Langer, head of the Communist Party at the time I left. This is only part of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where she obtained these documents?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. She obtained them from the Progressive Book Store on Eighth Street, I believe, in Los Angeles. I went with her to Los Angeles on several occasions when she bought them.

May I say something about these?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It is a particularly dangerous thing, I think. The Communist Party members don't believe our newspapers. They regard our newspapers as merely Wall Street propaganda, that they have been bought and sold by the big companies. They subscribe to the People's World and Daily Worker. That is their daily newspaper. They read it and believe every word of it. They distribute these.

Instead of Life magazine, they read these and believe every word of them. They have a deep personal loyalty to the Soviet Union and not to this country at all.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an attractive looking magazine and I have seen it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the title?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Soviet Union.

There is a new one, I don't remember the exact title; I think it is New China. There should be a copy of it. It is exactly the same except it is from China instead of the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACKSON. To the extent all those publications were not sold, the coffers of the Communist Party suffered to some extent.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, but the publications are always sold.

Mr. JACKSON. Were these sold?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. One buys them.

Mr. JACKSON. These weren't sold?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Were these sold, these copies?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. You see, Verna Langer, or whoever was head of the Communist Party at that time, goes to Los Angeles and obtains them from the Progressive Book Store. She brings them back in large quantities and then the Communist Party members locally buy them from her.

Three of the requirements of the Communist Party are: First, you have to pay Communist Party dues; second, you have to attend Communist Party meetings regularly; and, third, you have to read the Communist Party publications.

Mr. JACKSON. This material on the desk was not sold, was it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I bought it from Verna Langer and the Communist Party. She sold it to me as she did to the other Communist Party members. They are not publicly sold.

Another booklet that is required is the Political Affairs booklet. It has directions to the party members from the National Communist Party in it each month.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is this document which I hand you the publication from China that you spoke of a moment ago.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No. This is one of them. However, they put out one just exactly the same size; in fact, you can't tell it from these except for the difference in the title, and the pictures are a little different.

The CHAIRMAN. The photography in this large one is very good.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It is incredible that these magazines are printed in the United States and sold to party members for 20 cents apiece. It obviously would not cover the cost of the material as propaganda material.

Mr. TAVENNER. They are printed on extremely good paper, are they not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have the latest attack on the immigration laws?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. There is one booklet on the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. TAVENNER. See if you can find it and let the chairman see it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am aware of all that propaganda.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This is honestly a very small part of the literature that I received.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me one of these documents entitled "The California Quarterly, Salt of the Earth, Summer 1953."

Will you identify that document and tell us what it is?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. This is a copy of the play that was made into a motion picture by Herbert Biberman in Los Angeles. It was based on the strikes in the copper mines, I believe, in New Mexico.

Mr. JACKSON. The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. We collected money and gave it to them. The movie was good.

Mr. DOYLE. One of those pamphlets on the table in front of you is really not a pamphlet but a book consisting of many, many pages.

It is a bound book consisting of how many pages?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. 235 pages printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics called the Dawn of a Great Project.

Mr. DOYLE. How many pages are in this other book that you are now looking at? What is the title?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. One is High Treason, the Plot Against the People, by Albert Kahn, 372 pages.

Mr. DOYLE. The book in your right hand, how many pages does it have?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This is The Last Illusion, America's Plan for World Domination, 447 pages.

Mr. DOYLE. In what year was it published?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was in 1954.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked those questions, Mr. Chairman, to have the record show they were not mere paper-backed pamphlets but were books, many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. It is interesting to note that this attack on the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act was issued by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born, which is a Communist organization, and the introduction is signed by Abner Green, who is a well-known Communist.

So I say I am very proud of the enemies I have made.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Abner Green speak in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, he did.

Here is another leaflet you might be interested in on the Velde committee, Danger to Labor. This one is the new format of the Digest of Soviet News, put out by the American-Russian Institute.

Mr. JACKSON. This is not exactly apropos to the subject under discussion, but inasmuch as the chairman was not with the committee last April—I believe it was last April when the subcommittee, Mr. Doyle and myself were here—I came up the steps, and the present witness handed me a rather offensive brochure—that is, offensive as far as the committee was concerned—which I took a quick look at and promptly discarded, and although I have never asked her, as I walked up the steps, I am sure she hissed at me. I think Mrs. Schneider missed her calling—she should have been an actress.

Mr. DOYLE. I think she did the same thing substantially with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't think she overlooked anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very glad I wasn't here.

Mr. DOYLE. At that time, Madame Witness, you were an FBI agent instead of being a bona fide Communist, were you not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I was.

Mr. DOYLE. Are we going to mention the occasion of the meeting later that same night?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; we will develop that.

Mr. DOYLE. That will show you the method of infiltration of the Communists of San Diego.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you buy any of this material yourself?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I bought all of it. I have much more of it at home.

The CHAIRMAN. To that extent the Department of Justice is contributing to the Communist Party, if you were buying the stuff.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, there is another way to look at it. It was taken out of circulation.

Mr. DOYLE. As a matter of record, you have discussed these books and the pamphlets on the table and I am not able to count them from this distance, but I estimate there are more than 75 different books and pamphlets on the witness table there; is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, but remember, this is really a very small portion of the booklets we were sold. I spent, I am sure, between 10, around 10 to 12 dollars a month for booklets, and then, in addition, the books that we bought were more. The books that we bought that were sold, written by William Z. Foster, for example, cost \$6 apiece and they were required reading.

Mr. TAVENNER. May the committee staff retain these documents for a reasonable length of time to examine them more fully?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Surely you may.

This is one that might be of interest. This is the International Communist newspaper.

Mr. TAVENNER. From Prague?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it is.

In spite of the fact that the American Communist Party is supposed to be completely independent, many of the booklets we bought, or were sold, rather, were from inside the Soviet Union or were direct publications of the International Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, as you were not in Los Angeles, I should probably state for your benefit that we were able to read into the record at that hearing resolutions, or, rather, letters addressed to the President of the United States, signed by a number of persons in this country which were transmitted by code from Prague to various parts of the world as Communist propaganda material, which indicates the use that is made of persons' signatures to letters that they do not understand the purpose of.

Now, may I ask you to go back in your experience in the Communist Party and tell us who was the organizer of the Communist Party—that is, the principal leader of the Communist Party—in San Diego at the time you first became a member, and then state each successive person who held that position?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At the time I joined, Celia Shermis was head of the Communist Party. She was succeeded by Verna Langer. Verna Langer was replaced by John Kykyri.

When the Kykyris returned to Los Angeles, Verna Langer resumed the chairmanship. Verna was chairman when I left in January 1955.

Mr. TAVENNER. Verna Langer was subpoenaed as a witness before this committee at the former hearing in San Diego last year and refused to testify.

You mentioned in the earlier part of your testimony Helen Dugdale. What was her husband's name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Bert Dugdale.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where Bert Dugdale is now?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe he is in the back of this room.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean where he lives now.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Unless he has moved, he lives just on the outskirts of the Alameda Air Station near Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that in Orange County?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe it is in Orange County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you of your own knowledge know of his position in the Communist Party in Orange County today?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know of my own knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his position in the Communist Party in San Diego, if any?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know what his position in the Communist Party is. I do know that he and his wife both were Communist Party members.

Bert Dugdale was chairman of the publicity committee of the Civil Rights Congress at the time I joined the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he active in that field?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, he was. Helen Dugdale was active in the Civil Rights Congress, and during the elections she became more active in the Independent Progressive Party also.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have a break at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Doyle, and the chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, I hand you a photostatic copy of a letter appearing on the stationery of the California Labor School, Inc., in San Francisco, purportedly addressed to you.

Will you examine it, please, and state what the occasion was for the writing of such a letter to you?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. When Dr. John Kingsbury was in San Diego, he found that one of my shortcomings in Marxist theory was in the field of dialectical materialism, which I didn't understand. He suggested I attend courses at the California Labor School and take the course from Dr. Roberts, the director of the school. He said he would put me in touch with Dr. Roberts, and while he was in San Diego he invited Dr. Holland Roberts to my home and we were introduced at the same time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Dr. Kingsbury interested in your becoming more proficient as a theoretical Communist by taking courses in dialectical materialism?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; he gave me a list also of over 73 books I should read just to increase my general background knowledge of Marxist theory.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why was Dr. Kingsbury so interested in improving your Communist education; do you know? Was any statement made to him as to plans for the future or anything of that character?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Well, Dr. and Mrs. Kingsbury discussed moving, the possibility of moving to Laguna Beach.

Dr. Kingsbury was considering writing his autobiography and suggested I might be interested in becoming his secretary when he

wrote it. He was interested in an organizational way also in a prospective Communist Party leader.

Mr. DOYLE. Were they not your house guests?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they were.

Mr. DOYLE. For several days?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they were.

Mr. DOYLE. At that time you were an FBI agent, were they your house guests?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Their purpose wasn't just to make a social call but their purpose was connected with some activity in the community, was it not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they were invited here as speakers for the San Diego Peace Forum and stayed at my house as a routine thing. Most of our peace forum speakers did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the letter addressed to Mrs. Schneider on the stationery of the California Labor School, Inc., in evidence and ask that it be marked "Schneider Exhibit 19."

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be so marked and received.

SCHNEIDER EXHIBIT NO. 19 (SAN DIEGO)

california labor school, inc.

321 DIVISADERO ST. - SAN FRANCISCO 17, CALIFORNIA - UNDERhill 3-3033-3074

education for
democracy
and peace

Director
HOLLAND ROBERTS

10th anniversary year
Feb. 13, 1953

Mrs. Anita Schneider
4169 Charles Street
La Mesa, Calif.

Dear Mrs. Schneider:


I am writing you at the suggestion of our mutual friends, John and Mabel Kingsbury. They have paid you a very high compliment, because of all the peace leaders they met on their trip South, you seemed to them to be doing the most significant work.

This letter is to extend our thanks to you for your cooperation in making their experiences available, and to extend you a cordial invitation to visit us at the School and the American Russian Institute, whenever you can come to the San Francisco Bay Area.

Perhaps you will be interested in the materials I am enclosing describing our School program. We would also like to interest you in our "Friendship Book" "We Pledge Peace," which is described in the enclosed leaflet. When it comes out, we would appreciate any assistance you can give us in distributing copies in new areas.

It is difficult for me to get away from my work, but if I should manage a trip to visit my son, Andrew, I hope I might meet you.

All cordial good wishes,


Holland Roberts, Director
California Labor School

52

Learn from the People—Teach the People

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to release the witness from the stand for the present.

THE CHAIRMAN. Will you step aside, please?

MR. TAVENNER. I would like to call as the next witness Celia Shermis.

THE CHAIRMAN. Celia Shermis, will you raise your right hand. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MRS. SHERMIS. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. CELIA SHERMIS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
BEN MARGOLIS**

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Celia Shermis.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Los Angeles?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mrs. Shermis?

Mrs. SHERMIS. 1870 South Herzog, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mrs. SHERMIS. About 21½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to that?

Mrs. SHERMIS. San Diego County.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a resident of San Diego County?

Mrs. SHERMIS. About 9½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, where did you reside?

Mrs. SHERMIS. In New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you born in New York City?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first move to California?

Mrs. SHERMIS. In August of 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I graduated from elementary school, went to business school.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what occupation are you now engaged?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I am a bookkeeper.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a bookkeeper?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Well, it is hard to say. I just worked for a few years before I was married, and I have been working for about a year and a half now.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the 9½ years that you were a resident in San Diego County, how were you employed?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I was not. I was a homemaker. I worked a very short period, a couple of months, as a temporary clerk in a store.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the Communist Party organizer in San Diego County in 1951?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I am sorry, sir; I am not going to answer any questions regarding my political affairs. I invoke the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned you would not testify regarding your political affairs. I am not asking about any political views or associations of yours. It is my purpose to inquire into Communist Party activities in this area.

Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the 9½ years you lived in San Diego County?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Again I am going to refuse to answer on the same grounds previously stated. I don't think it is the business of this committee to inquire into my political affairs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you advised any persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party to engage in Communist Party activities with any church or religious organization?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Will you please state the question again? I am sorry, I didn't hear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question, please?

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mrs. SHERMIS. Religion is personal property of every person, and I don't think it is the province of this committee to inquire as to whether or not people are members of what church, what organization.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee is not doing that, and you know it, so do not try to becloud the issue. You were asked a simple question, and what is your answer?

(Witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. SHERMIS. My answer is that I decline to state my opinions—rather, I decline to state anything regarding the Communist Party or any political affairs.

Mr. TAVENNER. For what reasons do you decline?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I am protected by the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution and I am sure the Supreme Court will uphold that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are very fortunate to live in a country where there is a Supreme Court with that power.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Will you wait a minute, please; just a moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I withdraw my question.

Were you a member of the San Diego Peace Forum while you were residing in San Diego County?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I think peace organizations are very necessary in any country.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a member of this peace organization?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I decline to state, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mrs. SHERMIS. On the grounds of the first and the fifth amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Civil Rights Congress while living in San Diego County?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I think that you are inquiring into my private life, and I don't think you have the right to do that, and again I am going to decline to state on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were aware of any effort being made by the Communist Party to influence or control the activity of the Independent Progressive Party in San Diego County during the period that you lived here and during the existence of that party?

(The witness conferred with her attorney.)

Mrs. SHERMIS. That is the same question, sir, that you asked me a little while ago. You are just rephrasing it, and you are wasting my time, the taxpayers' money, and I am going to refuse to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your answer?

Mrs. SHERMIS. I decline to state.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite obvious that this witness is not going to give the committee any information with respect to anything she may know of the Communist Party in San Diego. I see no reason for prolonging the interrogation.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not a bit surprised when I saw this whole thing being set up.

Have you any other questions you think ought to be asked?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I would like to ask one further question.

Did you hold any executive position in the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Same question, sir, and the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Same question, same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Same question?

Mrs. SHERMIS. Yes; I said I was not going to answer any questions—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Why don't you let her finish?

The CHAIRMAN. You may keep quiet. We are being very tolerant to allow you to sit here.

Mr. MARGOLIS. You are being tolerant to let her have right to counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. We are tolerant allowing you to be here.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Me? You mean you are tolerant because she has counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. Not because she has counsel, but because—

Mr. TAVENNER, what was your question?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Are you attacking me? If so, I want to answer you, and I will.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been interrogated and have taken the fifth amendment.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I have been interrogated once by this committee and I took the fifth amendment, and I will take it again, and the Supreme Court says you can't draw any conclusions from my taking it.

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I protest. I protest your attempt to harass the witness through her counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Please call your next witness.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Mr. Chairman, may I call your attention to the fact that when there are witnesses—

Audience VOICES. Sit down.

Mr. MARGOLIS. These people—

Audience VOICES. Sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. Call your next witness.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Apparently they can get away with anything if they are friendly to the committee, but if anybody said anything friendly to the witness, they would be thrown out.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Kykyri.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God; do you so swear?

Mr. KYKYRI. Yes, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN KYKYRI, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
BEN MARGOLIS**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. KYKYRI. John Kykyri.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted the same counsel accompanies you who accompanied the former witness.

When and where were you born, Mr. Kykyri?

Mr. KYKYRI. I was born in Sparta, Minn., December 13, 1898.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in San Diego?

Mr. KYKYRI. I do not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you live?

Mr. KYKYRI. I live in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mr. KYKYRI. Approximately a year and a half.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, where did you reside?

Mr. KYKYRI. I lived in San Diego County.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a resident of San Diego?

Mr. KYKYRI. I would say about two and a half years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your professional occupation?

Mr. KYKYRI. I am a newspaperman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a reporter?

Mr. KYKYRI. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed while you lived two and a half years in San Diego?

Mr. KYKYRI. I was employed in various occupations. I was not in the newspaper profession.

Mr. TAVENNER. What profession were you in?

Mr. KYKYRI. I was a common laborer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any other position while being a common laborer?

Mr. KYKYRI. I was a truck driver.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any other employment besides that of a truck driver?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I did not have any other employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any other work while engaged as a truck driver?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. What is your definition of "work"?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will let you define it.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I can't answer the question until I can understand it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any employment, whether for compensation or not, other than that of being a truck driver while you lived in San Diego?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I am trying to puzzle this out. Employment. That means compensation, doesn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. I said without compensation.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I wasn't on anybody's payroll.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was not my question.

Will you answer the question, please?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I don't understand the question any further than that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold a position of any character in San Diego County, whether for compensation or not, during the period that you lived in San Diego County, other than that of being a truck driver?

Mr. KYKYRI. Any other position. I can't recall any other position at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you an organizer for the Communist Party?

Mr. KYKYRI. That is a question that goes into my private and political beliefs. This committee is on a witch-hunting expedition, it is here for smear purpose, goes into my associations as a newspaper man, and I plead the first amendment and the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What newspaper are you employed by?

Mr. KYKYRI. That question goes into my——

The CHAIRMAN. You were so anxious to have us ask you about your employment. I asked you very frankly and simply: Where are you now employed?

Mr. KYKYRI. Mr. Chairman, I beg your pardon. I am not anxious about your questions. I don't care about people being smeared. I don't care about people being unfairly treated before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you employed at the present time?

Mr. KYKYRI. I refuse to state under the first and fifth amendments, the first amendment particularly, because I am a newspaper man and the first amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. You say you are a newspaper man?

Mr. KYKYRI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you employed by the San Diego newspapers?

Mr. KYKYRI. I am not employed in San Diego. I am not residing in San Diego. I made that clear already.

The CHAIRMAN. What newspaper employed you?

Mr. KYKYRI. I refuse to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. JACKSON. I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question as to your employment.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. Mr. Chairman, I will stand on my answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been employed by the People's World?

Mr. KYKYRI. Look, I have answered the question already.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the first time you have been asked that question.

Mr. KYKYRI. Then if that isn't clear, this is a fishing expedition, and I will answer the same as I answered a moment ago.

Mr. JACKSON. Do I understand you decline to answer the question?

Mr. KYKYRI. On the same ground as the previous question.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't know that working for a responsible newspaper could incriminate a person.

The CHAIRMAN. Your question is predicated on a false premise.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you relieve Verna Langer as the organizational head of the Communist Party in San Diego?

Mr. KYKYRI. This is the same kind of a smearing question. I refuse to answer it on the same grounds, the first and the fifth amendments. I have my right to my associations, I think, under the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, if you know, what part the Communist Party has played in San Diego in the organization of the Independent Progressive Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. Mr. Jackson just a few minutes ago indicated that this line of questioning was a waste of time and the taxpayers' money. I think we could let it go at that.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the last witness.

We think this is no waste of time because we know you can give us the kind of information the people of the United States have charged us with the responsibility of getting, and you have a great opportunity at this minute, so we do not consider this a waste of any time at all. You take all the time you like.

Mr. KYKYRI. It is a waste of time, isn't it?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a waste of my time.

Mr. KYKYRI. I think it is a waste of time because I refuse to answer the question on the first and the fifth amendments. Let's proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. KYKYRI. Come, that question is right along the same line. I refuse to answer it on the same grounds, the first and the fifth amendments, and I don't want it implied that I am guilty of anything. I am an innocent, honest American citizen like the rest of the people.

Mr. JACKSON. "Me thinketh he doth protest too much," Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KYKYRI. Mr. Jackson, you have had those protests from your Government witnesses here all the time, all the morning; a pair of stool pigeons, by the way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you are now a reporter for the People's World?

Mr. KYKYRI. May I have that question again, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you are at the present time a news reporter for the People's World?

Mr. KYKYRI. I believe I have answered that question twice.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, you have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's try it again.

Are you a reporter for the People's World?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. KYKYRI. I think I will give you the same answer, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you refuse to answer because of the privileges given to you by the Constitution of the greatest Republic in the world, is that it?

Mr. KYKYRI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You wouldn't want to amend that statement, would you?

Mr. KYKYRI. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bert Dugdale.

Mr. DUGDALE. Can we have no pictures, please, on this?

The CHAIRMAN. At the outset, we believe in freedom of the press.

Mr. DUGDALE. I protest.

The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand.

Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DUGDALE. Yes, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF BERT O. DUGDALE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
BEN MARGOLIS**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. DUGDALE. My name is Bert O. Dugdale?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by the same counsel as accompanied the previous witness.

When and where were you born, Mr. Dugdale?

Mr. DUGDALE. I was born in Pomona in 1903.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you also known by the name of Bert?

Do you have the nickname "Bert"?

Mr. DUGDALE. Yes; I am known by the name of Bert. I am also known by the name of Doug sometimes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. DUGDALE. Los Alamitos.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. DUGDALE. I am at present a gardener. I mow lawns for a living.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived at your present place of residence?

Mr. DUGDALE. Approximately 4 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, where did you reside?

Mr. DUGDALE. In San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in San Diego?

Mr. DUGDALE. I have lived in San Diego off and on for a period of twenty-some-odd years, not continuously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you engage in any other business at your present place of residence besides the type of work which you have described?

Mr. DUGDALE. I was a machinist for a number of years because I enjoyed that work and until the time that I was first out of that employment because of the activities of a predecessor of this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did the predecessor of this committee have to do with your loss of employment?

Mr. DUGDALE. It has come to my attention, and it follows through in my own case, that many people lost their jobs immediately upon being brought up before such a committee as this. That has been true of a number of people that were brought up before Jack Tenney's committee, and was true in my case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you brought up before this committee?

Mr. DUGDALE. I was brought up before the Tenney committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not brought up before this committee until now; is that true?

Mr. DUGDALE. Am I in error in saying that the Tenney committee was a predecessor of this committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. You certainly are.

Mr. DUGDALE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your being brought before the Tenney committee have anything to do with Communist Party activities?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DUGDALE. I confused the two committees because the Tenney committee obviously was engaged in the same type of witch-hunt that characterizes the work of this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose you answer my question. You are not answering it.

Mr. DUGDALE. Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was this: Were you brought before the Tenney committee on any matter relating to communism?

Mr. DUGDALE. The witnesses before the Tenney committee, as applies to the witnesses before this committee, are not charged with anything. I was given to understand that the Tenney committee was engaged in such an investigation.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us you were brought in before the Tenney committee. I want to find out about what.

You just tell us why you were brought before the Tenney committee.

Mr. DUGDALE. If you are more versed on the subject of what the Tenney committee was required to do than I am——

Mr. JACKSON. I ask that the witness be required to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. He said as a result of being called before the Tenney committee he lost his position.

Mr. DUGDALE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. We are giving you a great opportunity to clear this wrong that was done you, so answer the questions and the atmosphere will be cleared.

Mr. DUGDALE. I don't think you are giving me any such opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; we are going to give you the chance to answer a lot of questions.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner, and give this man an opportunity.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were you brought before the Tenney committee for?

Mr. DUGDALE. I haven't that information at my fingertips. I can't answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you brought before the Tenney committee?

Mr. DUGDALE. I can only presume certain things, and I may be in error on them.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't make a mistake. What questions were you asked by the Tenney committee?

Mr. DUGDALE. It has been 5, or 6, or 7 years, I think, since then and I can't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. You ask the questions, Mr. Tavenner, not based on any other proceedings.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you brought before the Tenney committee?

Mr. DUGDALE. I can't give you a date on that. It seems to me it was about 7 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, had you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DUGDALE. That question obviously is a question which I am protected by the first and fifth amendments of the constitution of the United States from having to answer. I therefore rely on this in refusing to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you state was the place of your residence at this time?

Mr. DUGDALE. Los Alamitos, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that in Orange County?

Mr. DUGDALE. That is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you presently the Communist Party organizer of Orange County?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DUGDALE. I refuse to answer any questions concerning my supposed knowledge in the Communist Party on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. You weren't asked about knowledge of the Communist Party. You were asked a specific question.

Are you the Communist Party organizer today in Orange County?

Mr. DUGDALE. I see. I will refuse to answer any questions concerning the Communist Party on the basis of the existence of the first and the fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you lived in San Diego County, were you active in an organization known as the Independent Progressive Party?

Mr. DUGDALE. I think that question comes in the same category, and I shall refuse to answer it for the same reason as given.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement that a question relating to the Independent Progressive Party was the same as the question relating to Communist Party membership?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DUGDALE. This committee appears to be attempting to levy some kind of an economic reprisal against people belonging to either one of these organizations and several other organizations that have been mentioned.

For that reason, I refuse to participate in this sort of a deal and do not wish to answer the question. I rely on the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution in refusing.

The CHAIRMAN. You refused to answer the question a moment ago as to whether or not you were a member of the Independent Progressive Party because you said it was the same as the other question relating to the Communist Party.

By that, do I understand you to mean that they are synonymous?

Mr. DUGDALE. I didn't say they were synonymous. I said as far as my relation to the question is concerned, there was a sufficient similarity for me to give you the same answer. Is that clear?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is very clear to me.

I would go further than that and say that they are one and the same thing.

Mr. DUGDALE. That is your privilege, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course it is, and I don't plead the first and fifth amendments when I say it.

Mr. DUGDALE. No; I wouldn't either if I were sitting up there.

Mr. JACKSON. Why don't you run for Congress and you might be sitting up here, although I doubt it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether you were active while in San Diego in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. DUGDALE. No; I will not tell the committee that on the basis of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party while you resided in San Diego County?

Mr. DUGDALE. I don't know why you keep asking me that question. It is obvious that I am not going to answer that question because of reasons stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you decline to answer?

Mr. DUGDALE. I decline for reasons stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in the San Diego Peace Forum while you resided in San Diego?

Mr. DUGDALE. That question I will refuse to answer because of the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I just don't quite understand that. You refuse to answer the question about the peace movement because it might incriminate you or because you might incriminate yourself? What is criminal about this peace activity?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DUGDALE. Whether I think anything is criminal about a committee or not is beside the point. The committees that are under investigation seem to be regarded as criminal, and I have stated my reasons for refusing to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

The witness is excused.

Is there anything further?

The committee will stand in recess until 9:30 in the morning. Those witnesses who are under subpoena to be here today will be here tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p. m., the hearing recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a. m. of the following day.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA

WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
San Diego, California.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 9:30 a. m., Chamber of Commerce Building, 435 West Broadway, San Diego, Calif., Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel; William A. Wheeler, staff investigator, and Deputy Sheriff Robert S. Newsom, San Diego County.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Tavenner, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to recall Mrs. Schneider. Mrs. Schneider has been sworn.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, you advised the committee yesterday of general directions given by the Communist Party to its members to work or to endeavor to work within church organizations. You have described to the committee the activities of Communist Party members within the Community Unitarian Fellowship. You have also told the committee about your own specific assignments to endeavor to work in church organizations.

I ask you whether or not assignments were given to other members of the Communist Party to work in church organizations.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; these assignments were given to other Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of them successful, in doing any organizational work within churches?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. None of the Communist Party members that were assigned to church work were successful as far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then there should be no reflection of any character cast upon the churches to which these individuals were assigned. On

the contrary they are to be commended for not permitting it to be successful. Will you proceed to tell us about those assignments?

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Schneider, was this college professor whose case was finally disposed of yesterday by the Supreme Court, a Communist?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; he was.

The CHAIRMAN. I ask that question because I heard a radio broadcast this morning which was slanted that while he had refused to answer questions asked him by this committee and the board of education, as a matter of principle, he had told some newspaper men that he was not a member of the Communist Party. But are you now stating under oath that he was a Communist?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. When he said he was not a Communist Party member he was not under oath. When he was asked the same question under oath he refused to testify about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. What disturbed me was this very obvious attempt on the part of a news commentator this morning to create the impression that there was doubt as to whether or not he was a Communist.

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is a lie. I speak as the one referred to. That is a lie.

The CHAIRMAN. You know what you can do about it. Sit down, please.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work with Mr. Harry Steinmetz in the Civil Rights Congress work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; I didn't work with Dr. Steinmetz in the Civil Rights Congress work. When I was first asked to join the Civil Rights Congress I was given a membership application to make out. I took it to Dr. Steinmetz on the college campus and asked for his advice about joining the organization. He said that I was too nice a girl to get mixed up in the same kind of red baiting that he had been subjected to during his life, that I should not join the organization officially, but that I should do as he did, support it in every way, to contribute money to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what organization are you speaking?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Civil Rights Congress. I should contribute money to it, that I should continue to give it support but that I should keep my name off of its official membership list in order to avoid prosecution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee about the assignments of members of the Communist Party to work in church organizations in San Diego.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. In cases of which I was aware Dorothy Kykuri had discussed the church attendance with several Communist Party members. In my case we discussed which church in my locality would be the best one for me to work in. I slightly exaggerated my success in church work with the result that the other Communist Party members came to me for advice asking how they could improve their work in churches also. Paul Sleeth, who was a member of the Communist Party, discussed his attendance at the Pacific Beach Methodist Church, said he had been very unsuccessful and asked for suggestions about improving his work in it.

Arthur Stevens discussed his church work. He said that he had been attending the Asbury Methodist Church at one time. June Langdon discussed her church assignment. She said she had been directed to work in the Jewish Community Center which was a new organization at that time.

Originally, Celia Shermis and Verna Langer had discussed it with me. Celia Shermis made the statement that if Verna Langer could sing in the choir I could certainly teach a Sunday School class. I don't remember any others that had been definitely assigned to churches.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described the use that the San Diego Peace Forum made of certain facilities for showing propaganda films. Was there any other activity in this field in which the Communist Party took part in San Diego? Was any organization formed, in which the Communist Party played any part, which had for its purpose the showing of films?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. In the summer of 1953, I believe, the Communist Party started an organization called the Little Theater Film Club which operated for about a month or 5 weeks in San Diego which showed films at the Puppet Theater in Balboa Park once a week during that time. The original organizer of the group was an ex-Communist, I don't know whether you want me to name him or not. He was applying for readmittance into the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know of your own knowledge that he was a former member of the Communist Party, but you do know he was asking for admittance into the Communist Party, is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He had asked me to check on his New York Communist Party membership to find out what had been the disposition of his case when it was brought up before the Communist Party, whether there was any chance of his regaining ground and he gave me the name of the Communist Party organizer to ask in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think you should advise the committee about that.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. His name was Eddie Forrey. That has been some time ago. I reported the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I don't remember the name of the Communist Party organizer in New York any longer, but Mr. Forrey was a member of the party, I believe, for about 7 years and was very active, he was a merchant seaman. He said he struck a superior officer aboard ship and was expelled from his union and from the—No, he was expelled from the Communist Party because they thought he was an FBI undercover agent. He had been an alcoholic, he came to San Diego and was trying to rebuild his life and got a job but he worked on the film club for about a month in trying to regain his position in the party. He was unsuccessful.

Mr. TAVENNER. In connection with the films that were used by that organization, did you have any part in obtaining films for its use?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did.

The wife of my Communist Party attorney in Los Angeles was the one who arranged a series of films in the First Unitarian Church. I contacted him for information about where we could get the kind of films we wanted to show before a progressive group. He said I should telephone Jim Wallace at the Western Cinema Guild in San Francisco and reach them through him.

Mr. TAVENNER. What steps did you then take?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The films that we got were rather old ones, some of them were from inside the Soviet Union, most of the shorts that we got were. All of them were extremely left films. However, one of the very last ones that had been shown for a very long time on the television, so we found it necessary to apply to the Peace Film Center they were showing, which showed it as a substitute. This was Adventure in Bukhara and also was made inside the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what steps you took in making application for those films?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We sent for catalogs from a progressive film group that I was aware of. They all sent us their catalogs. The film club I believe was considered successful. We had between 75 and 125 people in attendance each week and for a left-wing group in San Diego that is terrifically successful.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a nonprofit organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you obtain any film service from the Western Cinema Guild?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, we did. They were the group that arranged our series of films.

Mr. TAVENNER. What steps did you take to contact that organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That was the group that was recommended by the attorney's wife in Los Angeles. I telephoned and wrote to them to arrange the films.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say an attorney's wife?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you consult Peter Hyun in regard to any of these matters?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did. I discussed it with him. I met him at the home of Henry and Edith Siskind, S-i-s-k-i-n-d, in Los Angeles, and we discussed it there. They are in charge of the Peace Film Center there. We discussed continuing it as a regular thing in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have mentioned Mr. and Mrs. Siskind. I think you should make it clear at this point as to whether or not you knew them to be members of the Communist Party.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I do not mean to mention their names. I did not know them in that relationship. While I was in their home Peter Hyun came in and it was then that we discussed the film group.

Mr. TAVENNER. So there should be no connotation to your having mentioned their names in connection with this matter?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, I am sorry for doing it.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all right. Did you later contact another film distributor or organization regarding production of films, or discussion of films?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We were considering reorganizing the Peace Forum into a film group. We discussed that with the head of the American-Russian Institute in Los Angeles, Reva Mucha. I believe though that we discussed that in connection with the Peace Forum.

(Representative Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any correspondence with Herbert Biberman on the subject?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did. The production of Biberman's film *Salt of the Earth* had been delayed for some time because of the lack of money. He had contacted, I don't remember who first wrote—he wrote to us after I had asked the attorney in Los Angeles for suggestions for our film club. Biberman wrote to us suggesting that—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of that attorney? Have you referred to that attorney prior to this in the course of your testimony?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his name?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Richard Rykoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you an original letter bearing date of August 23, 1953, purportedly signed by Herbert Biberman, and I ask you to identify it and state whether or not you received it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. May the document be marked as "Schneider Exhibit No. 20." (San Diego.)

I ask that the Biberman letter relative to the proposed financing for the picture *Salt of the Earth* be incorporated in the record.

Mr. DOYLE (presiding). It is so received.

(The letter referred to follows:)

DEAR ANITA SCHNEIDER: This note goes off to you after a talk with Richard Rykoff. I would like to identify myself as the director of the motion picture *Salt of the Earth* * * * and I write you in its behalf.

Firstly, in spite of every obstacle, placed in our path by various governmental individuals and agencies * * * and private and public hoodlums * * * we have brought the picture through its assembly stages * * * and are now at the gates of the final process which will complete it.

The net effect of the attacks upon us has been nil so far as the quality and effectiveness of the picture is concerned. The picture is untouched. But these interferences have been damaging financially * * * that is to say they have raised our budget by about 20 percent.

Secondly, the script of the picture which accompanies this note, has been sent to over a thousand leaders of public opinion in this country and the world * * * it will be published in many countries in the near future. In Mexico, it will be serialized in *Nacional*, the Government newspaper beginning the end of this coming week. It will develop even more deeply the great interest and public appetite for this film which was so greatly stimulated at the time of Congressman Jackson's attack upon it in the halls of Congress while it was being made.

Thirdly, we have already received inquiries from many countries all over the world asking for release dates and prices. We have just about concluded arrangements for the distribution of the film in Mexico and Latin America.

Fourthly, the press in our country has been invaluable in placing its stamp of approval on the Americanism of this script. It was done by the *New York Times* in a special article from the chief of its Los Angeles staff. Only 3 days ago a leading editorial in the *Sante Fe New Mexican* * * * (a leading daily paper in Sante Fe, the capital of the State of New Mexico, where the picture was shot and where we had so much difficulty in the last days of shooting) wrote: "We have just read *Salt of the Earth* and we state that it is not subversive. A union has as much right to make a picture from its point of view as employers have to make them from their point of view. Any attempt to interfere with or prohibit the exhibition of this picture will be in the same class with book-burning."

Fifthly, because of the clear issue in this matter, the support for our showings in this country will have behind it one of the most important collections of people and organizations yet mustered in the cultural field. This picture will become in the opinion of many otherwise disinterested persons, the most important offensive action against McCarthyism yet made available to the people of our country. It is therefore important and urgent that it be completed with all speed.

Sixthly, even if all this were not true, it would be deserving of support in its own right. It is a beautiful, moving, optimistic propeople film without compare in American films. It has a tremendous audience appeal on a worldwide basis.

Now, for the reason this letter is addressed to you :

We raised, as loans, for a period of 2 years, with interest of 10 percent per annum, the sum of \$125,000 to make this film. Had the attacks not come, we should have completed it well within that original budget * * * representing a cost for this film which is only one-fifth of what it would have cost any studio to make it. We have contributed all our services * * * writer, director, producer and others on staff level. We are committed to returning every penny we have raised plus interest before we will take a penny from the returns of this picture. It was because of this that we were able to raise the necessary sums to make the picture.

But with the delays and problems which the attacks forced us to cope with in addition to normal problems of production, we require an additional \$20,000 to complete the film. We require this immediately in order that the film may be completed within the shortest possible period of time * * * 8 to 10 weeks, if the necessary funds are quickly obtained.

We seek to raise this sum in exactly the same way * * * as loans * * * for 2 years * * * with interest at 10 percent per annum.

I had wished to reach one given individual in San Diego, and discussed this with Dick. He suggested that before I did anything in this direction, I ought to write you and seek to enlist your assistance in this matter. .

Perhaps any of the following things might be done :

1. Certain individuals might be spoken to by you in advance of my coming down.

2. If there are a group of 6 or 8 who are sufficiently close to each other so that they could be assembled at one time * * * a date set for me to meet with them. (At which time I could see others who might better be seen individually.)

3. Perhaps in certain instances you might be able to complete such arrangements even without my presence.

We do not take any loan of under \$1,000.

We are not seeking gifts * * * but loans upon a material basis of a film completed in all but its most final stages.

I know you will permit me to say this * * * we are all terribly occupied and the loss of several days is most difficult at this moment. Therefore, we would not wish to come to San Diego unless we were reasonably certain of being able to obtain a good share of what we require.

Our interest in bringing San Diego into the picture is varied. We require money * * * yes * * * but we would also like to have people there participating in and therefore rooted somewhat more closely to the entire future of the picture.

I would add one last point : we have ways of guaranteeing the individuals who make loans that their names will in no way be of record * * * and yet of establishing their monetary identity without question. We could not have raised the sums we have raised unless this had been satisfactorily arranged for many people.

I am certain you will accept the directness and frankness of this letter * * * in the interest of the project.

Dick tried to reach you last week and was unable to so do. I am writing this in order that it may be before you on your return * * * and I will be most happy to hear from you as soon as possible.

My address and telephone are listed below for you.

Need I add, my most sincere gratitude for your attention to, and what I know will be your interest in the matters it describes.

Most sincerely yours,

(s) HERBERT BIBERMAN,

3259 Deronda Drive, Hollywood 28, California, Hollywood 3-8366.

Mr. TAVENNER. I read from the letter as follows :

I had wished to reach one given individual in San Diego and discussed this with Dick. He suggested that before I did anything in this direction, I ought to write you and seek to enlist your assistance in this matter. Perhaps any of the following things might be done :

1. Certain individuals might be spoken to by you in advance of my coming down.

2. If there are a group of 6 or 8 who are sufficiently close to each other so that they could be assembled at one time * * * a date set for me to meet with them. (At which time I could see others who might better be seen individually.)

3. Perhaps, in certain instances you might be able to complete such arrangements even without my presence.

Do you know whether that had reference to this group which had been organized or what group was he speaking of when he referred to "certain individuals might be spoken to by you"?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I hesitate to answer that. It would be my interpretation of it if you want that.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; not if you do not know positively. Were you requested to assist in financing the production of the picture *Salt of the Earth*?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; we were. We were asked to try to raise in San Diego \$20,000 to help in the financing of the picture. It seemed like quite a bit particularly when they wanted it in loans of not less than a thousand dollars per person.

Mr. JACKSON. May I interject a question? I don't like to break your train of thought. You say we were asked—by "we," whom do you mean?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was asked.

Mr. JACKSON. You were asked. As a result of what? Was that to be a subscription from any one from whom money could be raised, or was it an appeal to the Communist Party? What I am trying to do is to tie down the source from which this money was hoped to be derived.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. My interpretation of it was it was an appeal to the Communist Party to help finance the picture. I took the problem to my Communist Party club and discussed it with Verna Langer and she merely laughed at the idea of raising \$20,000 in the Communist Party in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Biberman bearing date of August 24, 1953. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not you wrote that letter to Mr. Biberman?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I wrote the letter.

Mr. TAVENNER. May it be marked for identification only as "Schneider Exhibit No. 21." (San Diego.)

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will read a portion of it.

DEAR MR. BIBERMAN: The reason Dick was unable to reach me was that I had been extremely busy organizing a film club for the exact purpose of insuring the best possible showing of your motion picture here in San Diego. The leaflet enclosed will show some of our work. We have the use of an excellent little theater, good publicity all over the city, well known sponsors and feel certain that the club will be well enough established when *Salt of the Earth* is distributed to reach as many people as can be done.

Raising some of the money you need, it seems to me at least, should not be impossible. I am going to talk to several persons tomorrow and will let you know the results at once. "Us wealthy capitalists" should be able to give you the backing you must have for an enterprise of such value to all of us.

Was a campaign conducted to raise funds for the production of *Salt of the Earth*?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No; it wasn't. After discussing it with the head of the Communist Party and finding that it was disapproved, we didn't even try. I delayed in answering the letter and Mr. Biberman telephoned to me from Hollywood asking me about the results. I had to tell him that we couldn't raise the money in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any directions about terminating the activities of this particular club, little theater club?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I was. It was discussed at my regular Communist Party club meeting with Verna Langer. Although it was a success and many party members attended and it was attracting outsiders as well, I was told the Communist Party was using it as a substitute for action and it should be discontinued for that reason. People would come to the picture and watch the picture and then go home and then they weren't willing to spend as much time on their Communist Party work, so I was told to discontinue the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discontinue it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that one of the activities of the Communist Party in the San Diego area was work within the Independent Progressive Party. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became affiliated with the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. One of the first meetings that I attended was an opening meeting at the Filipino-American Veterans Hall on Market Street, I believe, at which Horace Alexander spoke. I filled out a card saying that I was willing to work in the Independent Progressive Party. At first the card wasn't answered, I wasn't contacted. I went to a Civil Rights Congress meeting where I met Lolita Gibson and Laura Stevenson Elston.

I said I hadn't been asked to work and wondered why it was. Elston said that was Arthur Stevens' big fault. He was never willing to involve as many people as should be involved in a mass activity. I was invited then to come to the Independent Progressive Party office and work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work in the Independent Progressive office?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general character of the work you performed?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We sent out mailings, notices of meetings. We mailed out propaganda leaflets, we distributed pamphlets, we wrote publicity, everything in general connected with a normal political party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that at this first meeting you attended, Horace Alexander was the speaker. I believe you referred to him earlier in your testimony but I want to make certain of that. Was he a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party? I want to get that clear.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I would like to explain my hesitation a little bit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest this. If there is any doubt in your mind I do not think that you should give any circumstances or details which might be short of positive identification. If you can positively identify him, say so; but if you cannot, I believe you better say so before making an explanation.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

What was Arthur Stevens' position in the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't remember what his exact title was at the very beginning. He was the executive secretary, he was the active organizer of the group at the time I joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. Please give the committee the names of those you can positively identify as Communist Party members who became active in the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. May I use my address book? It involves several people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The first one that I can identify as a Communist Party member who was active in the Independent Progressive Party was Carl Callendar. The second is Helen Dugdale. Also her husband, Bert Dugdale should be included.

Alberta Fouts, Lolita Gibson, and her husband, Howard Gibson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, with reference to these individuals mentioned, the party named Fouts, either did testify before the committee or held herself available to testify.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Alberta Fouts.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that should be in the record so there will be no misunderstanding as to her present status.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Also I would like to make it plain that these people were Communist Party members at the time that I joined; some of them may have been expelled from the party since or may have dropped out voluntarily. In her case I think she withdrew voluntarily.

Mr. JACKSON. If you have such information, Mrs. Schneider, I think it would be well to state it at the time of identification.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. O. B. Hagen, who was expelled from the Communist Party. Mignon Jenkyns. Charles and Elsie Jacques. Bess and Leo Lueb. Joseph and Verna Langer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you, was Dave Starcevic one of this group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. Dave and Miriam Starcevic both, with members of the group. Bill Rubens.

Mr. TAVENNER. What business was Starcevic engaged in?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At the time I knew him he didn't have a job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not the Communist Party criticized him in any meeting for any business activity in which he was engaged?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. Mr. Starcevic told me himself about it. He had been building a series of apartments on his own property and had remodeled a house and built a house in addition. He had rented them to other people. That was against the Communist Party principles. They were living from income from the apartments and you can't take money away from the poor working people. On one occasion he had actually caused eviction of some of his renters because they had not paid their rent, which is completely against Communist Party principles. He was very much criticized for doing it and in the end I was told he sold his apartment for that reason.

Mr. JACKSON. Was this the same party the committee heard in Seattle?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not Seattle. That was the same name but not the same individual. He was before this committee, however, in April of last year in San Diego.

(Representative Walter returned to the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tavenner, would this be a good place to call another witness and have this witness step aside?

Mr. TAVENNER. She has not quite finished this question.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Harry and Celia Shermis. Paul Sleeth. David and Miriam Starcevic. Arthur Stevens.

I also have the name of someone who was applying for readmission into the Communist Party who was active in this group. Do you want that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Laura Colwell Smith, who was a witness last year. Phil Usquiano, Theresa Vidal. Carmen Edwards.

Those are all of the names that I have in my address book. I don't think I can recall any others independently right now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, you say you would like for this witness to step aside at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Mrs. Schneider, will you please step aside at this point and I will call Harry Steinmetz.

Raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HARRY STEINMETZ

The CHAIRMAN. Have a seat.

Mr. Steinmetz, a few moments ago when this preceding witness stated that you were a Communist you rose in the rear of the room and shouted that "that's a lie."

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Her statement was a lie because I am not, and at the time that she was testifying about, a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Is that anything that you can legislate on?

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking you whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party. It has nothing to do with legislation. However, it is the duty of this committee—

Mr. STEINMETZ. I know that. I have heard that many times. I came here today in view of the decision—

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind what you came here for. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. With regard to all periods before 1940, I stand on the first and the fifth amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, up to 1940 you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I did not say that. You are saying that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I am saying it.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes, you are. This is the type of thing you love to say. I came here—

The CHAIRMAN. I dislike it very much because I am an American and I dislike to see people of that type before me.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I am a descendant of the American Revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. But were you a member of the Communist Party up to 1940?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I say that with regard to—can't you understand me—all periods before 1940, before 1939—

The CHAIRMAN. What date in 1939?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I give you no date. I am exercising my rights as a citizen to use the Constitution with regard to a period of my life that is none of your business.

The CHAIRMAN. Up to 1939 you say that you refuse to answer the question because it is a right under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Because it is a right of the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. It is a right under the Constitution.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now since 1939 up to the present time have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I say this because this is a very important time in my life for what has happened in the last couple of days. I say it with no evaluation as a simple straightforward matter of fact. No, I am not and have not been.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you use the same constitutional privileges in answering that question as you used in answering the preceding question?

Mr. STEINMETZ. In answering the preceding question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Because it is my right to refrain from discussing with you something that is none of your business under the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the business of the United States to warn the people against the kind of thing—

Mr. STEINMETZ. It is not your business to act as a court and that is what you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking you questions about your activities.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Government by intimidation is exactly what you are attempting and the blowup of all this business here is so ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind the stump speech. I have heard better ones from the same kind of people.

Mr. TAVENNER, what was the name of the other witness who put this person in the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Ann Kenny.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Ann Kenny?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, I don't know any Ann Kenny.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the period she stated he was a Communist?

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Kenny was describing a fraction meeting of the Communist Party within the American Federation of Teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. You might go into that.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Seventeen years ago. Let's go into it.

Mr. JACKSON. May I make a statement relative to whether or not we have jurisdiction or authority to question this witness or any witness engaged in his occupation, which was at the time I understand that of teaching.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You may pass legislation with regard to that matter.

Mr. JACKSON. We certainly may. It is the business of the Congress to legislate in almost any area, and that right has frequently been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are enlarging it.

Mr. JACKSON. There is abundant testimony before this committee that the Communist Party made a strong effort to infiltrate teachers into every level of our educational system with a deliberate purpose in view.

Mr. STEINMETZ. So has the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

Mr. JACKSON. At such time as you have any evidence that either of those parties has sought by force and violence to overthrow this Government, we shall investigate it.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You have no such evidence about——

Mr. JACKSON. However, Mr. Chairman, we have a perfect right to inquire into the activities of one who is charged in the educational system with the education of children.

Mr. STEINMETZ. There has never been a criticism of my work in education, and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not only our right but it is our duty, duty imposed upon this committee by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. This witness doesn't care about a duty imposed on this committee by the Congress of the United States. I doubt very much whether he cares anything about the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I certainly do.

Mr. JACKSON. So far as I am concerned, whether or not he has carried a card in the Communist Party since 1939, the accumulated evidence will indicate that if he hasn't he owes the Communist Party money in dues.

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is the kind of snide and petty stuff that you take advantage of your position to throw out.

Mr. JACKSON. Your attitude, sir, is one of complete contempt.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Your attitude is contempt of a witness. You stooped to the name calling first.

Mr. JACKSON. It has not changed in the interim. You have demonstrated nothing but contempt for this committee, nothing but contempt for its appointed duties. As far as I am concerned I intend to carry forward with the same sort of thing I am doing in line with the charge laid upon us by the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be interesting to note that at the beginning of this session of the Congress the appropriation for this committee was voted by a unanimous vote, not one single vote out of 435 Members was cast against the appropriation.

Mr. STEINMETZ. We all know about those appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not talking about——

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are not talking to me, you are using this occasion to make political——

Mr. DOYLE. Since 1939, the date you fixed—when was that period you asked, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. DOYLE. Since 1939, which is the date you fixed, I repeat, have you attended a Communist Party meeting in San Diego or in any other place?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking about a closed Communist Party meeting, but about any meeting to your knowledge dominated and arranged for by the Communist Party in San Diego.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Recognized as a Communist Party meeting; no, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You are avoiding the question whether you intend to or not. I am asking you whether or not to your personal knowledge you attended or participated in any meeting in the San Diego area known to you to have been arranged for by Communist Party leaders in San Diego. Do you understand my question?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes, I do.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, I am asking you if you attended or participated in any meetings in the San Diego area since 1939 known to you to have been arranged for by Communist leaders in San Diego. If so, where.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Mr. Doyle, conscientiously as I try to think back now, I don't think so; but please recognize I am not supported by an attorney on this occasion; you took advantage of me in the back of the room.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that was no advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody took advantage of you; you didn't have an attorney to advise you when you jumped up in the hearing room and shouted.

Mr. STEINMETZ. When somebody lies about me I don't need an attorney.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not need an attorney now.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You put me under oath and ask me catchy questions. I don't trust you. I have heard you too many times. I don't trust you. I think my answer is I don't think so, Mr. Doyle. I really don't think so. I don't know what you have got in there and with these kind of people you may produce evidence that some meeting I attended was drummed up by Communist Party members and that I attended but I don't think that I ever did so consciously.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you have not been a Communist since 1939.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Subject to the matter of my hearing—

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are right, pardon me.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there is nothing wrong with my ears.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are right, I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Steinmetz, we will go to the period before 1939, that period when you decline to answer questions. Even if it is a crime to be a member of the Communist Party the statute of limitations has long since run. Why don't you tell us about the period before 1939 so that this committee may make suggestions by way of legislation and by way of warning the American people against innocently becoming involved in conspiracies.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I will tell you why, because I think that history is an on-going affair from day to day and we each have a responsibility for contributing to the history of the time that we are in. You can't legislate with regard to the past. I can't change the past.

The CHAIRMAN. We don't want to change the past. What we want to do is make innocent, well-meaning people aware of the pitfalls of

this conspiracy so that they may avoid them and not be embarrassed as you have probably been. That is what we are trying to do. With that in mind, will you tell us about the period before 1939.

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is very touching, but I should say not.

The CHAIRMAN. Not touching enough.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Not at all touching enough, sir. This is so ridiculous to go back to the depression years.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1939; I didn't know there was a depression then.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You didn't?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Thousands did, Mr. Walter, thousands did.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness has volunteered the information that since 1939 he has not been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Which makes your witness a liar.

Mr. JACKSON. In view of that and in view of the somewhat moot question of waiver of immunity I am going to ask a question and then ask that the witness be directed to answer. Were you in 1938 a member of the Communist Party, either in San Diego or anywhere else?

Mr. STEINMETZ. In San Diego or any place else. You mean there would be a difference between being a member in San Diego and some place else?

Mr. JACKSON. Not necessarily. I phrased it that way because it is quite conceivable you might have been a member some place else and not in San Diego. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1938?

Mr. STEINMETZ. In 1938. I have stood on the first and the fifth amendments with regard to the period of 1940 and there is nothing clever in that question. I am not answering it.

Mr. JACKSON. It was not intended to be clever.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I have already told you very plainly that with regard to the period before 1939 I do not choose to answer on grounds of the first and the fifth amendments. And further, the Supreme Court decision in the Emspak case, I will add that.

Mr. JACKSON. That is precisely the reason I phrased my question the way I have. In light of the finding in the recent cases before the Supreme Court in which the majority pointed out that a witness must be informed that there is a possibility of a citation for contempt if the committee makes it perfectly clear to him that it does not accept his answer as being a legal use of the fifth amendment, I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, I do not accept that answer as being a proper use of the fifth amendment, and I ask that the Chair direct the witness to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Steinmetz, you are directed to answer the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party before 1938.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Are you offering me immunity or something?

Mr. JACKSON. I am asking you a question.

Mr. STEINMETZ. And I have given you the answer that on grounds of the first and the fifth amendment I do not believe that you have the authority to require me to answer. You said the statute of limitations had——

Mr. JACKSON. Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes, sir; I refuse flatly to answer on grounds cited.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have a few questions.

Were you a member of the American Federation of Teachers union prior to 1940?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I am inclined to go along with you on this, but I don't have an attorney. I have already cited a diminished fifth amendment, you can recognize, which is not the end of a party but pertains to my rights I think, and so I want to ask you as a lawyer should I not be consistent and answer this question about the American Federation of Teachers in the same way.

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Having cited Supreme Court decisions, I think you are well enough acquainted with the law to answer a simple question.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I have already said I wouldn't answer questions about before that period in the Thirties on grounds of the first and fifth amendments. Now you ask me about the union matter that is related of course to—

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you for the purpose of following it up to inquire as we started to do when you were called as a witness before this committee once before, as to whether or not you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities within that group or any knowledge of Communist Party purposes to take over that group and why. That is the general course of my questioning so I wanted you to know what it is I am interested in.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Very good. I will accept that as the question, if you will allow me, and say that I will then cite the first and the fifth amendment again and say I won't testify about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that teachers' union a Communist organization?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard evidence at a number of different places in the United States regarding the effort that the Communist Party made to take over the teachers union. One of the foremost leaders in that field was Dr. Bella V. Dodd of New York City. In many places the Communists were entirely unsuccessful; some places they were successful, as indicated in the city of Philadelphia where the national organization canceled the charter of the local union.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that at the time when 39 school teachers were fired because they were Communists?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; that occurred much later. It is the same place.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Steinmetz, what can you tell us about this union?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Well, Mr. Walter, I would refuse to discuss anything in that union pertaining to what you call conspiracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Then let's forget that.

Will you tell us what you know about the union? It may well be there are many San Diego teachers who are members of it and if they knew what you probably know about it would they cease to be members.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Well, pardon me. I don't think there is any union here. I don't think there is. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this teachers union in existence in San Diego? Is there a chapter here now?

Mr. STEINMETZ. There may possibly be. I am not sure.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there one here 10 years ago?

Mr. STEINMETZ. That would be 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's go back to, say, 1939.

Mr. STEINMETZ. 1939, I think there was.

The CHAIRMAN. There was?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think there was one that went out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. You know there was because you were a member of it, weren't you?

Mr. STEINMETZ. It went out of existence that year. Don't try to make a liar out of me. You don't know. You weren't a member.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know that it went out of existence that year?

Mr. STEINMETZ. About that time it dwindled away and ceased to function and didn't exist any more and hasn't since, far as I know—

The CHAIRMAN. Who were the officers when it ceased to exist?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't remember. Really I don't remember.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you one of the officers?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't think so in 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. You would know.

Mr. STEINMETZ. No; I wouldn't necessarily. I have been a member of a few things.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think you were an officer of the union, but you were a member of it, weren't you?

Mr. STEINMETZ. In 1939?

The CHAIRMAN. Or 1938, or at any time.

Mr. STEINMETZ. 1938, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a member?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Of course, yes, sir. I was a member. It is a matter of record I was a member of it.

The CHAIRMAN. It took me nine questions to get from you the answer you could have given Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Very clever.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were a member, did you observe any effort on the part of the Communist Party to take over the leadership in that organization?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think, as a lawyer you should let me, with regard to any matter pertaining to this so-called conspiracy, stand as I have tried to on the first and the fifth amendments for the period before 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not my decision. That is your decision.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't have benefit of an attorney here. You plucked me out of the audience for this and I came up only and volunteered that your previous witness lied about me and so she did.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not volunteering anything. You are here because of a subpoena which you invited.

Mr. STEINMETZ. On account of a lie by one of your witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner. I do not like you calling this fine American citizen a liar. If you were half the American she is you wouldn't be sitting where you are this minute.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Do I have to continue to take this?

The CHAIRMAN. No; you don't have to continue to take anything. Just answer questions.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, when she said you were a member of the Communist Party you had been a member of the Communist Party but you now contend that you were not at the time she was in the party. That is your contention, isn't it?

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are talking about this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, Mrs. Schneider, the preceding witness.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I said that I am not and was not at the time, at the period about which she was testifying a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. But she was correct in her statement when she said that you were a member of the Communist Party?

The CHAIRMAN. At some time.

Mr. STEINMETZ. She didn't say that, did she? She said I was at the time she was testifying about it of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. She didn't specify.

Mr. STEINMETZ. She didn't specify?

Mr. TAVENNER. She didn't specify, but she was correct insofar as she said that you were a member of the Communist Party, wasn't she?

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is a construction you want. That is no construction I accept.

Mr. TAVENNER. If we place that construction on it, it is truthful, isn't it?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I stand on the first and the fifth with regard to the period before 1940 and 1939, and anybody——

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mrs. Schneider?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Oh, yes. I knew that person at college and subsequently saw her in the community.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you see her quite a bit in the community since 1951?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Are you entrapping me? Are you entrapping me?

Mr. TAVENNER. Answer the question.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I stand on the first and fifth amendments with regard to this witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Verna Langer?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I stand on the first and fifth. That is one of the names I saw in the paper you had.

Mr. TAVENNER. Haven't you conferred with Verna Langer many times on Communist Party matters since 1951?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I would like to answer that but I am forced to stand on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you confer with Mrs. Schneider on the setting up of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I would like to, I really would like to exchange views with you on that not under oath, but under oath I am going to stand on the first and fifth amendments. I mean to honestly. I mean it very honestly.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a very fine forum. Let's exchange views.

Mr. STEINMETZ. It is a wonderful forum.

The CHAIRMAN. Or rather, let's lay the cards on the table.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You are so interested in matters pertaining to public welfare. It is very touching. You blow this little activity of a few people in San Diego exemplifying their principles and beliefs into a worldwide conspiracy and overlook the things that really affect——

The CHAIRMAN. If you don't think communism is a worldwide conspiracy you ought to go to the colleges that this boy mentioned by Mrs. Schneider attended for 12 years.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't know whether it is a minor incident to have branches of the Communist Party operating in a defense center such as San Diego. Perhaps it was a small matter, but it was not a small matter when Alger Hiss and his cronies were extracting information from the confidential files of the United States Government and transmitting it to potential enemies of the United States.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Let me tell you something. How about the infiltration of Nazis and Nazi sympathizers?

Mr. JACKSON. Which this committee has investigated.

Mr. STEINMETZ. And I initiated the FBI investigation of it in San Diego.

Mr. JACKSON. Congratulations to you.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I am very proud of that.

Mr. JACKSON. That is one great service and you can render another now.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I have rendered more than one service and far more unselfishly than you have ever rendered one in your life.

Mr. JACKSON. By your standards that may be true. I don't know.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You wouldn't take a chance on principle.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you at any time since 1951 conferred privately at any place with individuals known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Have I conferred with anybody who to my knowledge was an official of the Communist Party?

Mr. JACKSON. Known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Conferred.

Mr. JACKSON. Conferred with them privately.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I have talked to some that I suspected were Communist Party members.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt? Who were those people?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't give you my suspicions of people. My profession is one that depends on confidence and trust and freedom. I don't tell you whom I suspect and you have no business asking me that sort of thing. I am asked if I conferred with them. I have had no chance to prepare this. I don't think that I did as such, that they were, but I suspect that they might have been. You don't ask for that of your other witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. What gave rise to your suspicions? What gave rise to your suspicions that these people were Communists? They must have said something which indicated to you that they were not Americans or were un-American.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Un-American?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't concede that a person who even would have Communist convictions would necessarily, Mr. Walter, be in my definition, if he were an honest law abiding person, un-American. I am not willing to concede that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that now?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I believe that it is possible for a Communist to be a law-abiding American citizen—

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that?

Mr. STEINMETZ. And still have Communist convictions.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that in light of the action of the United States Congress in outlawing the Communist Party that a citizen today can be a member of the Communist Party which was proscribed by Federal law and still be a decent, God-fearing, law-abiding citizen of the United States?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Let's leave God out of it. You bring Him in so frequently it is sacrilegious, it is church and state which you are consistently trying to—you get people and try to browbeat them for public absolution. People like you are not morally——

Mr. JACKSON. We are not asking for a confession. We want to know what you know about the Communist Party and its operation. That is the job we are charged with and we will be derelict in our duties if we fail.

Mr. STEINMETZ. If I do anything of menace to this country I will tell you. If I were convinced there was any activity that was menacing our country I would tell you, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not an answer to the question, sir.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't know of anything—I have known some of these people who have been up here a long time and I have never known them to do an illegal act.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course you are placing yourself in the position of being the preeminent judge of whether or not any of your associates——

Mr. STEINMETZ. Who placed himself there? You placed yourself there.

Mr. JACKSON. By rising to your feet and characterizing the statement of a witness whose testimony to this point has stood up perfectly.

Mr. STEINMETZ. It has?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You say it still has to this point?

Mr. JACKSON. So far as I am concerned. I am not at all satisfied with the situation as it exists and I hope to explore the matter further and to develop——

Mr. STEINMETZ. I hope you will.

Mr. JACKSON. That there is corroborative evidence of your presence in the meetings as alleged. I for one would hope that the chairman would refer the transcript of the hearings as they relate to you to the Attorney General for action.

Mr. STEINMETZ. You hope you find it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tavenner, do you have anything more?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I read one very brief statement. This I read from a decision made June 8, 1955, in the case of *United States of America v. Sam Title*, in the Federal Court of Los Angeles. Hon. Leon R. Yankowitch. I will read one paragraph because it refers to a period, Dr. Steinmetz, which you——

Mr. STEINMETZ. And you know that period very well. You know the man who put you into office and then you sold him out.

Mr. DOYLE. This is what the honorable Judge Yankowitch said on June 8, 1955. I read it because you have said you believe a member of the Communist Party could be a patriotic law-abiding citizen.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I can conceive they might.

Mr. DOYLE. I can't.

(Representative Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE (reading):

During the period with which we are concerned, 1936 to 1941, a showing of membership in the Communist Party was not of itself a bar to citizenship. The proof in this case must therefore show that at the time the defendant made the statement of representation alluded to and took the oath of allegiance, and within the 10-year statutory period preceding the Communist Party was an organization which advocated the overthrow of the United States by force and violence. The evidence in the record, oral and documentary, including the documentary evidence offered in behalf of the defendant, shows conclusively that this was the teaching of the Communist party.

I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that this voluminous decision which I have of the honorable judge brings it right down to date and shows that down to the date of his decision as far as he knew—and we all recognize him as one of the scholarly judges in the Federal court—I am sure that right down to June 8, 1955, this honorable judge said "the Communist Party still teaches overthrow by force and violence in the United States." So that I can take it you see from that sort of analysis and other facts which I know as far as I am concerned at least since April 1945, no American citizen—

Mr. STEINMETZ. Can believe other than what you believe.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sorry you are so narrow in your opinion.

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is what you are saying. I obey the law. I don't have to believe it. We have not come to that point in this country yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tavenner, have you any questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the extent to which you have cooperated with Mrs. Schneider in the setting up of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I attended, it always consisted so far as I can remember, just of her, I never had much use for—at the college or afterwards—and really I didn't have much to do with it. I had a little but I don't remember the details. I was not active in it after the first few meetings. This employment of an informer to agitate for peace in order to turn in the names of sympathizers is pretty contemptible, isn't it? It seems to me—

The CHAIRMAN. That is very familiar. Every Communist that I have heard testify since I have been a reluctant member of this committee—

Mr. STEINMETZ. Reluctant member?

The CHAIRMAN. Has said exactly that from coast to coast.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Is that so?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STEINMETZ. This happens to be my conviction, that it is a contemptible thing for the FBI or anybody else to employ somebody to agitate for a laudable purpose like peace in order to turn in the names of sympathizers.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe the FBI has an idea that these phony peace movements are a menace to our institutions and our security.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think the FBI is a menace to our institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think that those who participate in it are almost traitors.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Is that so? I had a great uncle who started the FBI.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't care about your uncle.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I know the history of that organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind the stump speeches.

Mr. STEINMETZ. Just your own. Have your way. It is your party.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were aware of the fact she was a member of the Communist Party, were you not?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were aware of the fact that Verna Langer was the head of the Communist Party of San Diego, were you not?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not know they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, sir. I won't say that somebody I may not have suspected—I have already said I would not discuss suspicions.

The CHAIRMAN. You have categorically stated that neither of these two people was known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. STEINMETZ. That is right. Go ahead. Let it stand. They certainly didn't confer with me on that basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they confer with you on the basis of communism?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You never discussed Communist Party matters with Verna Langer?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Not to my memory ever.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not to your memory?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you make a positive statement about that?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think I can. I would like to talk this over with an attorney first before you make it a matter for some wire-tapping evidence or something like that, construing remarks made. I don't think this is fair unless you tell me that you have something in mind that I said or did or that she said or did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think he should be permitted to consult counsel since he has indicated a desire to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's withdraw the question. He has answered it in another form. Ask another question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Lloyd Hamlin?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think I can answer that all right but again I would like to have benefit of an attorney because he was quite a case with you, quite useful to you. I would like to review his testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not need an attorney to advise you as to whether or not you remember him.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I knew him, sure, I knew him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you talk to Lloyd Hamlin at any time on Communist Party matters?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't think I ever did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't think so?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No; I don't think I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you stating that you did not?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I would like the benefit of an attorney here. I am a little afraid of entrapment. I don't think I had occasion to, ever, but what do you mean by Communist Party matters? You see, he

was employed for a time as secretary of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was an agency collecting funds in this country for the benefit of the most hard-stricken refugees in the world of the Spanish Loyalist Government, and they were in camps in north Africa and France, as I understand it, receiving funds from whatever source they could get them.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have to tell us about that. I contributed substantial sums of money for the aid of those people myself.

Mr. STEINMETZ. I congratulate you, sir. I think that is very fine.

The CHAIRMAN. However, it was infiltrated and subsequently taken over by Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's fix the period now.

Mr. STEINMETZ. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee sent funds with the stipulation, as I understand it, to the Friends Service Committee and Unitarian Service Committee that their funds were to be used only on political refugees. That would mean from Spain—Communists, Republicans, Socialists, and Anarchists. Therefore it might have been that I would have discussed these beneficiaries of that fund collection with Mr. Hamlin which would constitute perhaps talking about Communists. I am afraid of your question, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Phrase the question differently so the witness has no fear of consequences.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you in this form: Did you at any time engage in any Communist Party activity with Mr. Hamlin?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, sir; not that I recognized as such. No, sir; not that I recognized as such.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the extent of your participation in the organization to which you have just referred, of which Mr. Hamlin was an official?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I think I have some record somewhere which would show offices. For a time I signed his paychecks. Cosigned his paychecks.

Mr. TAVENNER. What office did you hold?

Mr. STEINMETZ. I don't remember what it was called. I was one of the sponsors and he was responsible in part to me and I was responsible in part to others who came through representing the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. STEINMETZ. That must have been 1943. I don't know. I would have to look it up. I really have to look it up. But it was over a period of I suppose a year and a half. Late in the war.

(Representative Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. After 1939, however?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Celia Shermis?

Mr. STEINMETZ. She was one of your witnesses here. I stand on the first and fifth amendments, if I may with regard to my acquaintance with her. Or I will say "Yes," I do know her. I don't mind. And her husband painted my house, or part of it one time. He was a painter. That is about the extent of my contact, incidentally, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know her as the head of the Communist Party in San Diego?

Mr. STEINMETZ. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer at any time with her regarding the activities of the San Diego Peace Forum or other organizations in this community?

Mr. STEINMETZ. Not to my knowledge, memory, or belief.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness is excused and the committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

(Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to welcome this group of young students who have come in. This is refreshing to know that those of you who are studying civics are interested in our Government. For your benefit, I would like to state that this committee was elected by the House of Representatives for the purpose of bringing to the American people a realization that there are those in our midst who would destroy our form of government.

Secondly, for the purpose of recommending to the Congress of the United States the enactment of legislation to protect those institutions that have been so dear to all of us and as a result of which we have become the leading nation in the world. I trust that all of you know what America is, what it stands for, and will do all that you can as individual citizens to preserve our form of government.

Mr. Tavenner, will you proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mrs. Schneider, please.

TESTIMONY OF ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Schneider, will you come up, please.

I hope, Mrs. Schneider, you weren't disturbed by some of the unseemly remarks that were just made. Such remarks are disturbing to me when good Americans attempt to make a contribution to their country. So just consider the source of the remarks.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not at all. I realize in this sort of a case we expect counterattack.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, we were discussing the work of the Communist Party within the Independent Progressive Party, and you told us of certain types of work that you performed in the office of the Independent Progressive Party. Were you finally elevated to some position in the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I was. I became a member of the county central committee. I am not sure whether my name was entered on the register at the registrar of voters or not. But Arthur Stevens asked me to attend the county central committee meetings and to act on the county central committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, the extent to which the work of Communist Party members within that organization was directed and reviewed by the Communist Party in its meetings?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, sir. At each of the Communist club meetings that I attended a regular item on our agenda was review of our activities in each of the Communist front organizations.

My job as head of the San Diego Peace Forum was usually reviewed first. My activity in the Independent Progressive Party and the work that I had done in the office was always gone over carefully. My suggestions for the other party members who were active, my criticisms of

them were also brought up and studied at this time, changes that were necessary were made. My future activity in the Independent Progressive Party for the future 2 weeks was discussed also, and directions given for that.

Mr. DOYLE. What year did that commence and what year did it end? What year did the Communist Party in San Diego determine to infiltrate and attempt to take over the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We were taught in our Communist Party Club meetings a little bit different idea. We were told at the original inception of the Independent Progressive Party how it was formed and why it was formed. I don't think infiltration of the Independent Progressive Party by the Communists is quite correct since they were instrumental—

Mr. DOYLE. What was correct as to the relationship between the Communist Party and the Independent Progressive Party? What were you to do?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We were taught at our Communist club meetings that it had been decided within the Communist Party that it was time for a third major political party to be formed. The Independent Progressive Party was set up. It was headed by Henry Wallace with the idea that when Henry Wallace withdrew from the Democratic Party he would split the Democratic Party and take a large portion of it with him. The Independent Progressive platform, the Independent Progressive Party mode of operation was directed, at all times that I was aware of and at all times that it was talked about, by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you became a member of the central committee of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that on a county level or on a State level?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was the county central committee member on a county level. I was delegate to the regional meetings, over a period of time to several meetings, I don't remember how many. I was a delegate to the State convention in Sacramento in 1952 and a delegate to the national convention in Chicago in 1952. I was secretary of the cultural and academic freedom panel at the national convention also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other members of the Communist Party from San Diego who attended the convention of the Independent Progressive Party in Chicago?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. John and Dorothy Kykyri, Arthur Stevens, and Theresa Vidal also attended. They were all members of the Communist Party in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. So the only delegates from San Diego to the national convention from the Independent Progressive Party were members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is not quite true. We had one, the wife of one of the political candidates, who was later defeated, also went with us. It was felt that our delegation was politically incorrect; we had no colored members on our committee. Therefore they selected someone to attend so that our delegation would be correct, according to Marxist ideology, Communist Party ideology, rather.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that individual was not a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there another individual who held an office in the Independent Progressive Party who at first was selected as a delegate but who was not permitted to go to Chicago?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee about that, please.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Do you want the name of the individual involved?

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that individual a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, not to my knowledge. I am certain that she wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see no purpose in giving her name; just give us the information.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Surely. This woman had been active for many years in the Independent Progressive Party in the northern end of the county in the Fallbrook area. She had been instrumental in making a lot of the Independent Progressive Party activity effective. She got with our delegation as far as Los Angeles. We attended an all-day conference at which we were given instructions about programing and so on to use at the national convention but she wasn't following and had not been following the Communist Party instruction. When she got to Los Angeles therefore she was just eliminated from the delegation and it went on without her.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this individual had refused to follow Communist Party instructions?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who made the decision that this person was not to continue in the position that she held?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Jack Berman, Arthur Stevens; I don't remember other people being present. There possibly were.

Mr. JACKSON. I think, Mr. Chairman, in the context of the testimony there would be no great harm in showing the people of the Fallbrook area that there was some independent operation of this delegation. I would suggest that the name of the individual be put in the record who refused to follow the predetermined dictates of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so. I couldn't imagine there being any reflection on anybody who exercised that degree of courage.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the contrary, it would appear to be a matter for which she should be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Who was it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mrs. Vaida Arnold was the person who was eliminated from the delegation. The story goes a little bit further. After we returned from Chicago, she had been a delegate from the northern part of the county to the county central committee of the Independent Progressive Party here in San Diego. When we returned, an emergency meeting was called and she was invited to attend it. At that meeting her activity, her refusal to accept the directions—only it wasn't explained that it was Communist Party directions—anyway she was asked to resign as a result of it and she was thrown out of the county central committee.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, she wanted to exercise the freedom the Communists talk about and never practice.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose decision was it that she should be required to resign.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. A meeting was called in Fallbrook, Mignon Jenkyns—

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a meeting of what?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Of the Communist Party. Mignon Jenkyns, Jo Ann Hinchliffe and I met. I was asked because I was from the southern end of the county and was of some influence at that time on the county central committee. I was asked what we could do to get rid of her in San Diego, how they should cope with the problem. I suggested, I believe, that we call a county central committee meeting immediately. I went back—

Mr. TAVENNER. Central committee meeting of what group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Meeting of the Progressive Party. I went to my Communist club meeting; I believe Celia Shermis and Verna Langer were there. We discussed what to do about it. They said they contacted Arthur Stevens and asked him to call a special county central meeting at which she was invited to attend and then was thrown out.

Mr. TAVENNER. So then Arthur Stevens called this central committee meeting of the Independent Progressive Party at the direction of the head of the Communist Party in this area?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Arthur Stevens the head of the Independent Progressive Party during the entire period that you functioned with it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, he wasn't. He was replaced in 1952, I believe, by Dorothy Kykyri. She became ill and was replaced, I think, by Elsie Jaques. Elsie Jaques was replaced in time by Miriam Kusnierczyk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you go back to the point where you told us who succeeded Arthur Stevens? You said it was Dorothy Kykyri.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know that?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. When John Kykyri became chairman of the Communist Party in San Diego I began meeting with John and Dorothy Kykyri at my Communist Party club. I met with her over a period of months.

Mr. TAVENNER. So there you had the head of this organization, Arthur Stevens, a member of the Communist Party, you have Dorothy Kykyri who succeeded him, who was the wife of the Communist Party leader of this community and who herself was a member of the Communist Party, and then who is the next individual who succeeded her?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I have difficulty in identifying the next person as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. You should not speculate on it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That isn't true. I remember she was present at one closed Communist Party meeting in August or September of 1951. September or October, Elsie Jaques.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she head of the entire county organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, she was not. She merely kept the office open. It was between elections, nothing particularly was happening. She

ran the office as head of the office staff more or less. It was after the 1950 elections and nothing important was coming up at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other person at a later date who was the head of the Independent Progressive Party in San Diego and who was a member of the Communist Party. About what date was it that Elsie Jaques was acting in the capacity you described?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was in 1953, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you attended the national convention in Chicago in 1952. Do you recall who made the keynote speech at that convention?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I do. Dr. W. E. B. DuBois made the keynote speech.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a copy of what purports to be a text of his keynote speech. Will you state whether or not you obtained it at that time and if that was the speech which he delivered?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It is the best I remember. It was very long and very hot.

Mr. TAVENNER. I request that the document above referred to be marked, for identification only, as "Schneider Exhibit No. 22." (San Diego.)

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to read only the first 4 or 5 lines. They are as follows:

The platform of the Progressive Party may be reduced to these planks: Peace, stop the Korean war, offer friendship to the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, restore and rebuild the United States.

Other than the last item relating to the restoration and rebuilding of the United States, was this the Communist Party line at the time of the holding of this convention?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent did the Communist Party attempt to control participation of its members in the Independent Progressive Party; or their voting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Well, completely. I don't remember being given definite instructions as to which person we would vote for. It was assumed we would vote for the Independent Progressive Party candidate. After the elections, however, Communist Party members were sent to the registrar of voters to check the voting records for each precinct. On one occasion in Fallbrook a man who was a Communist Party member—2 people who were Communist Party members lived in 1 precinct, but there was only 1 Independent Progressive Party vote from that precinct which meant one of them had not voted the Independent Progressive Party. It resulted in the man's almost being thrown out of the Communist Party and when he ran for office as vice president of the county central committee he wasn't elected.

Mr. TAVENNER. County central committee of what?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Of the Independent Progressive Party. He was very seriously criticized for not voting the Independent Progressive Party. In my case my precinct was checked, and I was commended because there were two Independent Progressive Party votes from my precinct, my own and my husband's. I was expected to force him. Although he was a registered nonpartisan I was expected to have him vote Independent Progressive Party also.

Mr. JACKSON. You can plead the fifth amendment on this. I have no desire to violate the sanctity of the ballot, but did you vote for the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I wish there were some way I could change my registration for those years and take back my vote. I did.

Mr. JACKSON. Under the circumstances it was probably a good vote.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope your husband didn't hear you boast about controlling his vote.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was a matter of some concern beforehand, believe me. He voted Independent Progressive Party, too.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the only person I have seen in politics who had a vote in his vest pocket. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were the affairs of the Independent Progressive Party financed? That is, what method was used?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Voluntary subscriptions didn't cover the cost of operation of the Independent Progressive Party office. At the beginning of the time I was working in the Independent Progressive Party. Lolita Gibson was given the job of canvassing Communist Party members to raise money to finance the Independent Progressive Party office, and after she left the finances became very strained. We were asked to make pledges; Communist Party members were asked to make pledges to keep the Independent Progressive Party office open. There were also a very few non-Communists who made pledges who were Independent Progressive Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were these pledges supposed to operate on a monthly basis?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were these persons members of the Communist Party and members of the Independent Progressive Party who pledged these monthly contributions?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And some few were included in the pledge who were not members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. A very few.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any device designed to conceal the name of the person making the donation used in the making of payments of those pledges?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; it was used. We were given numbers according to, I don't know what it was according to, but we were all given numbers. We were sent a form on which the months that we had paid were checked. It had our number at the top. We were supposed to return the form with our number on top and enclose the money that we owed the office with it. A master list was kept in the office with the names of the people and the numbers on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean in the office of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. It was kept very much out of sight. At the time that I recall Elsie Jaques was in charge of that. Occasionally when Elsie was ill I took over the job and sent out the reminders of the pledges.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document and ask you if you can identify it and tell the committee what it is.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I can. This is the master list of the pledge list, of the Independent Progressive Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it kept in the office of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not some of the names used on this list were fictitious names—that is, persons made contributions but not under their own names?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I was instructed that when these people sent in checks as they occasionally did I was to credit to those numbers and those names.

Mr. TAVENNER. So those numbers were just treated as symbols so that it would conceal the real identity of the person making it until the number was checked with this master list?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct. It was not thought advisable that the general Independent Progressive Party membership should realize the extent of the Communist Party financial contribution to the office.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice your name on the list. Anita Schneider. And the number appearing after your name is 30-s. Then under the month of March there is an "X." Does that indicate that you made a contribution?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. It meant I paid my pledge for the month of March.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the amount appearing in the left-hand column is \$2.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the witness has stated that some of these are persons who were members of the Communist Party and some were not, I hesitate to introduce the document in evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. It shouldn't be made a matter of public record unless all of these people are Communists, because those records have a way of turning up.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask you to examine the document again, please, and if you can discover there a name which was a pseudonym, a name that you recall was not the true name of the contributor, and provided you know that the real contributor was a member of the Communist Party, I would like you to give the committee that information. Do you understand the question?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. If there is any doubt in your mind as to who used the particular name, I do not want the evidence.

(Representative Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to clarify the matter in my own mind. Are you asking her to identify only those pseudonyms and not other members of the Communist Party whose names are properly given?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just for the moment.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I hesitate to do so. The two names that I know that were pseudonyms are people who I know are members of the Communist Party, but I didn't attend closed meetings with them or anything. They were subject to Communist Party discipline, they contributed regularly to the Communist Party fund, they attended open and social meetings. I have never attended closed party meetings with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. The result is that your relationship with them was such that you do not feel like making a firm identification?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I know myself that they were Communist Party members. I can't say that I have attended a closed party meeting with them.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the criteria which the witness has given as to the extent of aid and support of the Communist Party with the understanding that it is not an identification in the sense of personal knowledge of the individual in a closed Communist Party meeting is nevertheless such information as this committee has accepted on other occasions as indicating assistance to the Communist Party as distinguished from positive identification. I personally see no reason why the names should not be given.

Mr. DOYLE. I agree. Unless you have a direction contrary to that, Mr. Tavenner—

Mr. JACKSON. We are trying to find out who supports, and to what extent propaganda is made possible by the efforts of individuals who, while they may not carry Communist Party cards, are still a part of the Communist Party apparatus.

Mr. DOYLE. Methods used to raise money.

Mr. JACKSON. Exactly.

Mr. DOYLE. Here is a place where they held socials, apparently, invited people in and these people knowingly gave money to Communist Party activities, as I understand the witness' statement, that the Communist Party was raising money at these socials, is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the witness has indicated enough doubt in her mind, it seems to me, that I don't know whether to pursue the question further in regard to those particular pseudonyms. The use of a pseudonym makes a difficult situation.

Mr. JACKSON. I won't press the matter if there is opposition.

Mr. DOYLE. You and I, Mr. Jackson, often bow to the wisdom of our counsel and I will do so at this time. Maybe later on they can be identified.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify from that list the amount of contribution made for the various months of those persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party and also give the symbol or number which was used as the device for concealing their real identity?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. John Carpadakis' symbol was 6-c. The amount was \$2 a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. What months did he make the contribution?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This is only checked for February. It does not necessarily mean that he didn't contribute any other months. We weren't very efficient.

Also I would like to explain these are not the only contributions. These are just pledges. Substantial contributions were also made. You are expected to contribute a dollar at each meeting with a speaker. You are expected to contribute at least a dollar at every dinner that is given, and at the money-raising socials they sell raffle tickets and so on. It is really very much more. Bert Dugdale, 42-d, \$1 a month. Carmen Edwards, 8-e, \$1. Lolita Gibson, 36-g, \$5 a month. Charles Jacques, 18-J, \$4 a month. John Kykyri, 21-k, \$3 a month. Verna Langer, 22-1, \$3 a month. Milton Lessner, 24-1, \$2 a month. Leo Lueb, 441-1, \$1 a month. Anita Schneider, 30-s, \$2 a month. Miriam Starcevic, 32-t, \$1 a month. Theresa Vidal, 446-S, \$2 a month.

The others I am not prepared to identify at this time. I would prefer discussing it with you.

Mr. TAVENNER. As having been members at that time?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. This is in addition to the contributions made on monthly basis and donated to people like Lolita Gibson. Lolita would collect them, \$5, \$10, and \$15 at a time from people who did not want their names on such a list. She would then turn the money over to the Independent Progressive Party officials. They would be given receipts just made out to "A friend." They insisted on giving the receipts, however, for the money.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you stated that you attended the State convention of the Independent Progressive Party held at Sacramento.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe in August 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any administrative position in that convention?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I was secretary of the State convention that year. I was also a member of the platform committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was the platform of the convention prepared?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Theoretically it was formed by the platform committee. The platform committee was to meet the first day, work out the platform of the State Independent Progressive Party for the following year, and then submit it to the secretary of state before 5 o'clock the next day in order to legally remain on the ballot. However, we had met for 2 days and had been unable to draw up an adequate State platform. Therefore, at 10 minutes after 5 I was given a mimeographed State platform and instructed to take it to the secretary of state to file. This was before the platform committee had even finished meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the source of the mimeographed platform which was used and actually filed?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was furnished by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it that gave it to you?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was given to me by an attorney whom I can't identify personally as a Communist Party member.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the source of your information that it came from the Communist Party, if you do not know the individual who handed it to you to have been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was discussed by the Communist Party members at the convention. They were criticized by other Communist Party members for having set up a meeting before the convention and having it all mimeographed, they said it was not politically correct, it looked odd to have a mimeographed platform already set up.

Mr. JACKSON. But the platform that was handed to you in mimeographed form was discussed in Communist Party meetings as being the one that had been developed for this purpose by the Communist Party to be filed with the secretary of state at the convention?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there two organizations in San Diego County of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. One was in the southern section of the county and one was in the northern section of the county.

Mr. TAVENNER. The activities which you have described were of which group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The official San Diego County, county central committee, the southern group.

Mr. TAVENNER. What knowledge do you have of the northern group to which you referred? What has been your opportunity for knowledge?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I know many of the members of the northern group of the county as Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know? What is the basis of your knowledge?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I attended two closed Communist Party meetings in the northern part of the county, and met with the head of the northern part of the county and Celia Shermis on one occasion when we delivered Communist Party literature to her for distribution in Fallbrook and Vista.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that individual?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mignon Jenkyns.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us again what her position was?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. She was head of the northern part of the county at the time we took the literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what organization?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Of the Communist Party.

I am not positive, I believe she was also head of the Independent Progressive Party in that section.

(Representative Walter returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very convenient place to make a break.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—JULY 6, 1955

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mrs. Schneider, please.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, are you familiar with an organization known as the Committee for the Defense of the Bill of Rights?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what you know about its organization and composition?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights was active in the Los Angeles area, I think, primarily. Did you mean our local little Bill of Rights Defense Committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not the Los Angeles group?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I am just speaking of San Diego.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was invited to attend a meeting of the Bill of Rights Defense Committee at the Hillcrest Community Unitarian Fellowship, 648 Robinson Street. I believe that has been changed to Front Street at the present time. I don't know the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been changed but you don't know the exact address?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct. When I arrived at the meeting I can remember some of the people that were present. Verna Langer was present, Milton Lessner was present, David Starcevic was present. Obed Rosen was present, Theresa Vidal was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of that last name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. V-i-d-a-l. I don't remember right at the moment any other people being present besides myself. Plans were being made for a meeting to oppose the appearance of the House Un-American Activities Committee. This was just previous to your appearance here in San Diego last April, a year ago last April.

The Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights had ordered 30,000 leaflets, anticommittee leaflets, to be distributed in the area in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I understand. This meeting of this group was at the hall of the Community Unitarian Fellowship. Did it just meet at that hall or did it have any connection with that fellowship, do you know?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was invited to attend the meeting by Laura Minor. And aside from that I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand you to say that they had printed 30,000 leaflets in opposition to this committee?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, that is correct. I do remember, I can remember what a non-Communist Party member had told me about the composition of the committee, why it had been formed. Do you want that information?

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that individual a member of this group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, he had been elected chairman of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this person was not a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he was chairman of this group and told you the purpose of the group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and I think you should also give us the name.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. His name was Frank Hamill. He said that the committee had been originally organized to protect, I don't remember the expression he used, protect members of the group—I think from attack by the Government or by such committees as this. He said it was primarily devoted to the defense of Dr. Harry Steinmetz. In this case the committee had voted to distribute 30,000 leaflets and was having a problem finding enough people to distribute them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he present at this meeting of the group to which you have referred?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, he was not. He did not appear and 30,000 leaflets were there to be distributed. Then Verna Langer assumed the chairmanship of the meeting and conducted the business at hand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Verna Langer at that time the organizational head of the Communist Party in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. So she took over the chairmanship of this meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, anything else that happened at that meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. She had a list of the trade union meetings that were being held between that time and the time of the appearance of the committee in San Diego. She explained to us that that was where the largest groups of people would be meeting and that we should divide up into pairs to distribute leaflets at each of the meetings. She and the man who was with her, I don't remember who went with her, distributed leaflets at the electrical workers union. I really don't remember which units each of the other members were assigned to. I and Whitey Rosen were given the central labor council meeting to distribute leaflets at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Whitey his correct name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, his name is Obed. He is never referred to as anything but Whitey.

Mr. TAVENNER. You and he were assigned to distribute these leaflets prepared by this organization at the central labor council?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us what occurred.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Quimby became very angry at the left-wing leaflets and he sent three members, I was told, of the teamsters union down to discourage us from distributing it in front of the union hall. They did and we left.

Mr. TAVENNER. They did what?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They did discourage us and we left the meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were opposed to the use of that type of propaganda?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Completely, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. With the result that you were not successful in your Communist Party assignment?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct. Also plans were made for a distribution in the downtown areas. I believe, I don't remember the exact details. Friday nights I think the stores were open late at that time and we were assigned street corners to be on for distribution of leaflets. Obed Rosen and I and Lee Major were also assigned the Linda Vista housing area to be covered as much as possible by the distribution of those leaflets. Paul Sleeth, Dave Starcevic, June Langdon, and a group of the rest of us were distributing them in the downtown area in the daytime when Paul Sleeth was arrested for blocking the sidewalk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go back a moment. You said this action was initiated in this meeting of the Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; that is correct. The distribution of the leaflets did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of these persons whom you have mentioned, members of the Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights as far as you know?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe all of them were. I know I was invited to join the group. Unless I am mistaken there was no written formal organization. It was just a group of people that met for that purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did these handbills have anything on them to indicate what organization was sponsoring them?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I believe they had on them the Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights. I am not sure that is the exact title, but it is something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated the chairman of that organization was not a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his name?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Frank Hamill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he withdrew from participation in this enterprise?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He was unwilling to distribute leaflets. I am aware of another time that he did become frightened. I don't think the committee has been reactivated since then. At the same time that committee had invited Rev. A. A. Heist, former regional head of the American Civil Liberties Union to speak at San Diego for this committee. I was told that the Unitarian Fellowship had decided that until that charter was granted they shouldn't present that left-wing speaker at that hall, they were going to look around to rent another public hall for his appearance, that they would back the meeting and everything, they had made arrangements with a stage group from Los Angeles to come down but they couldn't have it there at the hall.

When Rev. A. A. Heist came down Mr. Hamill did meet him at the train. He made arrangements for some one else to take him to dinner. He didn't come to the meeting, and I haven't seen him since.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this organization did not have him to speak before the Committee for the Defense of the Bill of Rights?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct. I had had a Communist club meeting with Verna Langer that morning. She had directed me to telephone all over San Diego trying to find a public hall for Reverend Heist's appearance in San Diego. Each time we were refused a hall. None of the public halls was willing to rent their hall for that purpose. It was suggested to me that since I was a program chairman of the 30th District Young Democrats I would be able to rent a hall for this purpose under that name.

Verna Langer gave me \$40 from the Communist Party club to pay for the hall rental and for the mailing of notices which were to be sent out and distributed.

At the meeting that night at the Bill of Rights Defense Committee meeting, it was decided that Obed Rosen, Theresa Vidal, and I should be the ones to distribute leaflets in front of this building, since all three of us were again registered Democrats.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now let me interrupt you at this point. You say you held some position within the 30th District Young Democrats of this city?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not it was at the direction of the Communist Party that you became interested and worked in that organization.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; it was. Some time previously we were having disagreements in the Independent Progressive Party office. I backed the members of the staff that were opposing the official Communist Party direction and made myself very unpopular at the Independent Progressive Party office. I was meeting at that time with Dorothy Kykuri and John Kykuri.

They showed me a draft I believe of the Communist Party platform and a plan of work for the Communist Party in San Diego which I mimeographed for them. This included the idea that we should re-register, I don't believe register, directed us to work in the broader political organization. Dorothy said at that time that we must quit thinking Independent Progressive Party, that San Diego was still thinking Independent Progressive Party, that it had to think on other terms. She directed me to change my registration to Democratic. Two weeks later when I met with her she asked me to take her to the registrar of voters and both of us would change our registration. I had already done so but I took her down and she changed hers to Democratic in my presence.

We were then told those of us who were registered Democrats—particularly Theresa Vidal was told to work in the coming campaign, the coming primary, last June; I was directed to become active in the Democratic Party also because I had been an active Democrat previously. I didn't do it. I didn't go to any of the meetings or anything. But Dr. Harry Steinmetz and Clinton St. John who had lost their positions under the Luckel bill were speaking for this group of the 30th District Young Democrats. I attended that meeting and one of the non-Communists present, a Democrat, recognized me and asked me to go to Fresno as a delegate to the Fresno State convention.

She remembered my Democratic activities from previous days but she had asked me in the presence of several Communist Party members and I felt I couldn't refuse, it was just what they had been urging me for months.

I was then elected to be vice president or program chairman of the Young Democrats who naturally knew absolutely nothing of my Communist Party background. They didn't know a thing about it.

When I met with Verna Langer at my Communist club meetings from that time until the time I was out of the 30th District Young Democrats she would check up on the progress of the Young Democrats, she would find out what I was doing and encourage me, order me to continue.

In this case she told me to rent the hall and to arrange the meeting, which I did.

MR. TAVENNER. Did she also tell you to put out the leaflets here in front of this building?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Which you did.

MR. JACKSON. Which she did very adequately. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? I don't want to break the continuity of the line of questioning, but I should like to know this: This is one of the few occasions when the committee has been in a city following a hearing such as the one held last April in San Diego. Did you have occasion to know what the effect was, if any, upon the party structure, upon its activities, as a result of that hearing?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes. The morning the subpoenas were first being delivered in San Diego was the first I had had any contact with it. Verna Langer called me up and asked me if I had anything to tell her. I told her I didn't. Finally she asked me to come over and to go to a telephone exchange and look in their master books for Los Angeles and find out the name of their Communist Party attorney, which was Ben Margolis. I returned to Verna with the telephone number.

Some of the other people who had been subpoenaed were then arriving with a subpoena. Between that time and probably for 3 or 4 months after the meetings there was almost no activity in the San Diego area and in fact, up until the present time I don't know of any effective organizational work that has been carried on. I do believe your committee meetings like this are extremely important and effective against communism.

Mr. JACKSON. It is interesting to learn from one who was in a position to watch the course of events related to the conduct of the hearings. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the time these hearings were going on did you see any members of the Communist Party at your home?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I had one of the only televisions in town in the Communist Party, I believe. They are against them. It is contrary to their ideas of culture, I think, at the present time. So that while the hearings were going on many of them came to my home and watched the hearings on television. I really believe that is another thing that the committee was very effective in. As far as I could see among the party members and among my neighbors all other activities stopped. Everybody stayed home and watched television. I don't think that newspaper publicity is as effective as seeing a committee like this in action.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say that from your observations that it had a wholesome effect as far as its influence on Communist Party activities was concerned?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I really believe that it did. The non-Communists, the ordinary people that were watching could understand for the first time, could really see in front of them the attitude of the Communist Party members that were being asked to testify. Some of the most liberal people in town, you know, considered this committee much on the basis of the McCarthy committee and on that basis disapproved of it. When they saw the fairness and the difference in the attitude of the committee they changed their minds completely.

The CHAIRMAN. This is just a new committee. Wait another 6 months and you will see what certain segments of the press have done with this committee. It is a pattern.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I do believe though that the use of television was extremely important. People who don't study and who only get a very condensed report from the newspaper do listen to every word on television.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described what your directions were and how you carried them out up to the time you were distributing these leaflets in front of this building during the hearings being conducted here beginning April 19, 1954. I want to call to the attention of the present subcommittee that at that time while one of the witnesses was testifying, I believe the very first witness, the following appears in the record as a statement made by Mr. Doyle:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I haven't spoken to you of this but as I entered the hall here this morning an hour ago there was handed to me on letter-sized paper without any official heading thereon a mimeographed sheet entitled "The Time Has Come." Of course that is freedom of American citizen to hand out literature. Thank God it is and I know we will always fight for that freedom of the press and freedom of public expression. But as you know, I am a registered Democrat. Now while I live in Los Angeles County I am not familiar with

whether there is such an organization as 30th District Young Democrats or not, but I think, Mr. Chairman, the public is entitled to know whether or not there is such an official group of young Democrats in San Diego County and if there is, who the officers thereof are and I would like to say that I as a Democrat would appreciate very much if there is such an organized group in San Diego County that they will identify themselves to me during these hearings so we may know whether this is just a phony designation by whoever wrote up this sheet or whether or not a really constituted group of young American citizens is sponsoring this.

I understood you to say that this organization of young Democrats knew nothing of the pamphlet or document you were distributing at that time.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is not quite correct. I was authorized to set up the meeting; I was authorized to mail out a leaflet. The leaflet wasn't read by anyone else on the executive board and the members of that group didn't know anything about the speaker or about the leftwing activity connected with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or about the propaganda that you had in this document?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is quite correct. I was authorized to set up the meeting but none of the leftwing business was authorized.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that part of the scheme of the Communist Party to use that organization for its own purpose?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes; quite correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Tavenner, this would be a good place to put in the record the current attack on this committee by practically the same group.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Communist Party group?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Here it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document entitled "Stoolpigeon Racket Exposed." Have you seen a copy of it prior to now?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I have. It was distributed in my neighborhood and I think half of my neighbors for miles around called me up telling me about it and offering to call the FBI, to call any one, somebody do something.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't be disturbed about that, the FBI had it before you did.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I am sure they did, but my neighbors were very concerned about it. They started telephoning.

Mr. JACKSON. They probably got one of the first proofs from the printer.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. One of them in fact brought this to me.

Mr. JACKSON. This pamphlet carries the designation of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I think so.

Mr. JACKSON. The Civil Rights Congress has been designated as a Communist-front organization, the source of the information will be taken at face value.

Mr. TAVENNER. This bears the notation that it was issued by the Civil Rights Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. And with typical courage contains no names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the accepted procedure in the Communist Party to concentrate the distribution of such material where those expected to testify would be certain to see it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, and they expected it to have a bad effect on the neighborhood. Actually of course, it didn't. It made people angry toward the person who was going to testify.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Schneider Exhibit No. 23."

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be marked and received in evidence.

SCHNEIDER EXHIBIT NO. 23 (SAN DIEGO)

STOOLPIGEON RACKET EXPOSED!

*Inside the Justice Department
Lie Factory . . .*

*Why Lies Are Manufactured
to Order . . .*

*How the FBI Gets Its Stoolie
to Come Through . . .*

YOU, THERE! Been reading the papers lately? That's some show Harvey Matusow, the self-confessed liar and stoolpigeon, is putting on—a real thriller-diller! Only it isn't just a TV show about some imaginary people. YOU are in the picture.

DON'T YOU SEE something wrong with the picture in our country? Isn't there something messing up the American democratic tradition of justice and fair play, in which a man is innocent until proved guilty beyond a shadow of doubt?

LOOK CLOSE! Behind the mask of justice there lurks today something that begins to look more and more like the Gestapo, reaching out with nameless informers, shadowy stoolpigeons, elusive fingermen . . . reaching out to thousands who have been fired from jobs of all kinds . . . hounded . . . harassed . . . reaching out . . .

TO YOU, whoever you are, a Westinghouse Air Brake worker like HAROLD K. BRINEY, a college teacher like DR. MELBA PHILLIPS, a minister like BISHOP OXNAM, a businessman like EDWARD LAMB, a Negro government employee like MRS. ANNA LEE MOSS, a scientist like DR. J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, a diplomat like DR. RALPH BUNCHE, a scholar like DR. RALPH BARTON PERRY, a student of foreign affairs like OWEN LATTIMORE, a publisher like DOROTHY SCHIFF, a radio commentator like ELMER DAVIS, a newspaperman like DREW PEARSON, a trade unionist like MAURICE TRAVIS, a Republican like REP. CHASE of N. J., a Democrat like SEN. MANSFIELD of Minnesota, and a Communist leader like EUGENE DENNIS.

It all began with Dennis, with the Communists, you know, and it grew and grew like a rolling snowball.

What is this THING threatening YOU, your security?

It's the BIG LIE, invented by HITLER, brought up to date by McCARTHY. It's the Big Lie of a COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY. Proof? There is no proof—not a bit that was ever brought into a court. Then how do you make the BIG LIE stick? Simple . . . a paid informer comes into court and lies his head off — singing for his supper.

And Here's the Big Deal . . .

Once the racket is working smoothly . . . once the Big Lie is sticking with people . . . then every time someone disagrees with McCarthy (or his followers) on foreign policy, on taxes, on wages, on desegregation, on schools, on Big Business give-aways, then they cry "communist," a couple of stoolpigeons do their stuff—and WHAM!—another scalp hangs from the McCarthyite belt — like Hiss and Remington and Ben Davis. . . . And who is next?

MATUSOW'S CONFESSION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

C 136-7

ELIZABETH GLENN FLETCHER, et al.,

Defendants.

STATE OF NEW YORK }

COUNTY OF NEW YORK }

ss:

HARVEY M. MATUSOW, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I make this affidavit in support of the motion by the defendants for a new trial and to do what I can to remedy the harm I

2. I am willing to appear and testify to the truth of the above matters of my time.

Harvey M. Matusow
Harvey M. Matusow

Subscribed to before me this

ANTI-RED WITNESS CONFESSES HE LIED

His Charge That Roy M. Cohn
Prefabricated Parts of
Testimony Is Denied

By EDWARD KANZAL

An ex-Communist who was a key Government witness in the trial of thirteen convicted secondary Communists leaders branded himself a professional perjurer yesterday.

Harvey Matusow, self-styled Federal Bureau of Investigation informer, asserted that he had deliberately testified falsely concerning some of the defendants. He further charged that part of his testimony was prefabricated by Roy M. Cohn, then an assistant United States Attorney.

Matusow's statement, in affidavit form, was filed in Federal Court here with a motion for a new trial for the thirteen leaders.

Feb. 1, 1955

New York Times

Feb. 16, 1955

MATUSOW ADMITS FAKING BLACKLIST

Ex-Communist Testifies He
Branded as 'Reds' Radio and
TV Stars He Didn't Know

By EDWARD KANZAL

Harvey Matusow admitted yesterday that he had fabricated a blacklist of radio and television personalities for an advertising agency. He added that many of these persons whom he had branded as "Reds" were not known to him.

The 28-year-old former Communist also told of being paid \$250 for ten days' work as a consultant to the Board of Education here in its investigation of teachers who were Communists. He said his knowledge in this field was "so limited" that he asked an investigator for some of his reports so he could justify the \$250.

Under cross-examination by

Do you think that's unreal . . . it can't happen here in our land?

Remember . . . remember the big TV show last summer? The Army-McCarthy shindig? That was real, wasn't it? Remember the phoned-up photograph? Remember the stolen document from secret files doctored up to cover up the snitch? Remember what side was responsible for this hoax—who the big shots were—McCarthy and Roy Cohn (remember this name . . . we'll meet this character again)? It was hard to break through that stone wall of secrecy.

But now a star in this cast of underworld characters HAS SPILLED THE BEANS—but good! HARVEY MATUSOW was a headlined informer—ranked with the best—in the upper brackets. And then something happened!

And Now the Dirt Is Out!

Here, as much as possible in his own words, out of his affidavit, Matusow tells what happened at the trial of the 13 Communist leaders in New York:

ITEM 1: "I gave false testimony when I testified that Defendant Perry said . . . (that) the working class, led by the Communist Party, would have to forcefully overthrow the bourgeoisie in order to set up the Negro nation while establishing socialism."

ITEM 2: "My testimony concerning this conversation with Defendant Trachtenberg is false. . . . At no time during the many occasions that I met with and talked with (him) did he indicate that he advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence. . . ."

ITEM 3: "My testimony concerning the statements I attributed to (Defendant Johnson) to the effect that it was necessary to get (the youth) into the trade unions in the mid-west in basic industries, and in the event of any war with the Soviet Union we would then have people on our side, is entirely false."

ITEM 4: "My testimony that (Defendant Charney) said that: 'Puerto Rico was being used as a military base by the U.S. and an independent Puerto Rico would help to destroy those bases and cripple the Caribbean defense'; and that 'He pointed out that the only time Puerto Rico would get its independence was when we had conducted an effective struggle for socialism and had overthrown the bourgeoisie there,' is entirely false."

ITEM 5: His testimony accusing Henry Winston of stating that Communist youth should get into mid-west basic industries "so that in the event of any imperialist war . . . we could help the side of the Soviet Union . . . and slow down production, and in some places call strikes, and in general see that the war production, in the event of a war, would not carry forward to its fullest capacity, was false."

ITEM 6: "The testimony concerning what Beatrice Siskind said is entirely false. I had no recollection at the time I testified, nor do I now have any recollection as to what if anything was taught to me. . . . The testimony was entirely fabricated to create the false impression with the court and . . . jury that the Communist Party taught and advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence."

DO YOU SEE HOW ALL THESE LIES HAVE TO DO WITH A "COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY," WITH "FORCE AND VIOLENCE"?

The government had to have this lying testimony to get a conviction. It had no other proof. The Big Lie can't live without informers. Well, ask Matusow:

ITEM 7: With regard to his testimony about Trachtenberg, Matusow swears the first discussion took place with Roy Cohn (remember him up above), then Assistant U.S. Attorney who worked with him in pre-

paring his testimony, "in a car driven by a Special Agent of the FBI," and that "U.S. Attorney David Marks, Roy Cohn and J. J. McCarthy, a Special Agent of the FBI, and two other individuals were seated in the car at the time"; and that in several sessions that followed with Cohn *"we developed the answer which I gave in my testimony"*; and that *"We both knew that Trachtenberg had never made the statements which I attributed to him in my testimony."*

ITEM 8: With regard to Siskind, "I had informed U.S. Attorney Roy Cohn that I was unable to recall what, if anything, she had said in the course. During several sessions I had with Cohn, *he helped me formulate the answer which I memorized and gave in my testimony . . . not based on what was actually said by Siskind, but was created for the purposes of the trial.*"

So you see, if you can't find the proof you need, you MANUFACTURE it. There is draft after draft of prepared "testimony" in which Cohn, in notes IN HIS OWN HANDWRITING, drags in "force and violence."

In fact, on one occasion, Matusow didn't do so well in his testimony, and the U.S. Attorney told him so. Matusow later explained at the new-trial hearings, "Oh, I hadn't memorized the whole thing well enough." At night, the U.S. Attorney refreshed his memory, and the next day he did OK.

Matusow has made a similar sworn confession about his testimony in the case of Clinton Jencks, prominent trade unionist found guilty of perjury on the basis primarily of Matusow's testimony, for which the U.S. Attorney had especially thanked him in a personal letter.

AND NOW COME TWO MORE STOOLPICEONS, Marie Natwig and Lowell Watson, WHO SWEAR THEY DID THE SAME THING IN THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION HEARINGS AGAINST TV OPERATOR, Edward Lamb. Marie Natwig SWEARS SHE WAS "COERCED" BY GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS WHO NEEDED HER LIES, and Watson SWEARS HE LIED REPEATEDLY ABOUT LAMB OWING TO THE "PERSUASIVE POWERS" OF THE F.C.C. INVESTIGATORS AND LEGAL STAFF. ONE OF THOSE WHO INVESTIGATED HIS LYING, Watson SWEARS, IS A PAID JUSTICE DEPARTMENT INFORMER NAMED William C. Cummings. THIS STOOLPIGEON Cummings, SIGNIFICANTLY, WAS ALSO A GOVERNMENT WITNESS IN THE DENNIS AND ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN CASES. ADDS UP, DOESN'T IT?

And that isn't all. Matusow has called the turn on stoolies Budenz, Lautner and Elizabeth Bentley. The lying of informers has been established publicly.

PAUL CROUCH, veteran informer, was exposed on the witness stand as a repeated perjurer in cases against Harry Bridges, Dr. Oppenheimer, Jacob Burck, the Philadelphia Smith Act defendants, etc.

MANNING JOHNSON was forced to admit his lying and his eagerness to lie a thousand times over, if necessary.

MILTON SANTWIRE and STEVEN SCHEMANSKE admitted perjury in the Michigan Smith Act trials.

The DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE has done nothing but protect these perjurers who are blackmailing the government with threats to spill the beans.

So here we have the whole dirty business right out of the horses' mouths, or only do McCarthyites rely on lies, THEY CREATE THE LIES. And not only is McCarthy and his immediate gang involved in this filth, BUT HIS POLITICAL FOLLOWERS IN THE HIGHEST ECHELONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, including the Justice Department and the FBI.

WITNESS SAYS SHE LIED

She Had Linked Radio and TV Operator With Communists

WASHINGTON, Feb. 10 (AP)—Mrs. Marie Natwig, 51-year-old Government witness, testified today that Government attorneys last October prevented her from repudiating her testimony that Edward Lamb once had been associated with Communists.

Recalled for further cross-examination at a Federal Communications Commission inquiry, she said she wanted then to say she had lied, but lawyer for the commission would not allow her to do so. They have said no attempt was made to influence her testimony.

The hearing, which began last September, is on allegations that Mr. Lamb, publisher of The Erie (Pa.) Dispatch and operator of radio and television stations, once knowingly associated with Communists and gave money to the Communist party.

Mr. Lamb is seeking renewal of his Erie television station license.

Feb. 11, 1955

New York Times

Feb. 19, 1955

SECOND WITNESS ADMITS F.C.C. LIES

Ex-Red's Testimony Disrupts Lamb Hearing—Absolves Justice Department

By RUSSELL BAKER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18—Harvey Matusow, the self-proclaimed liar, had more company today.

He was Lowell Watson, Kansas dairy farmer and former member of the Communist party. Like Mr. Matusow, he is one of the Justice Department's paid "expert" witnesses on internal communism.

Mr. Watson startled and snarled an already tangled Federal Communications Commission hearing today. He declared from the witness stand that he had given false testimony to link Edward O. Lamb to communism.

Mr. Lamb's license renewal hearing for blacklisting action

AND THEY DO IT BECAUSE CONVICTION IN COMMUNIST "CONSPIRACY" TRIALS, AND IN ALL OTHER POLITICAL TRIALS, INVESTIGATIONS, DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS, LOYALTY HEARINGS, IS IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT THE BIG LIE — WITHOUT STOOLPIGEONS — WITHOUT CREATING LIES OUT OF WHOLE CLOTH.

That's what the *San Francisco Chronicle* meant when it said editorially, "Informing is a dirty business, and . . . some of the dirt is quite likely to rub off on the practitioners." The practitioners are the U.S. Justice Department, which has been urged by 160 prominent initiators and sponsors in a petition "To Uphold Justice," to stop the use of paid informers and to reexamine their testimony in cases in which they participated.

The Justice Department and the FBI, by inventing lies, by honoring lying informers, by harassing weak individuals into becoming lying stoolpigeons, are making a wreck out of moral principles. That is why 19 outstanding ministers of various faiths have protested the government's use of paid informers and have called for a Senate Judiciary Committee investigation with public hearings.

That is why the CIO convention, the nationally known columnists, the Alsop brothers, the *New York Times*, the *Herald-Tribune*, the *New York Post*, the *Washington Post*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Democratic Digest*, the *Providence, R. I. Journal*, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, and other prominent individuals, organizations and periodicals have condemned the use of informers.

There is no point in gnashing your teeth at this rape of justice, at this continued persecution of innocent people. *The time has come to do something about it.* Something CAN be done, and MUST be done about it if every single American is to feel the security guaranteed by the Preamble to our Constitution. The American people once did do something when they forced the LaFollette investigation of the labor spy racket in the '30s.

They can do it again—NOW. Here's what:

WRITE OR WIRE to Sen. Harley M. Kilgore, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D. C., demanding a thorough investigation by his Committee—and not some McCarthyite set-up—of the government's use of paid informers.

WRITE OR WIRE to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Justice Department, Washington, D.C., demanding a new trial for the 13 New York Communist leaders on the basis of the new evidence in Matusow's confession.

WRITE OR WIRE to Attorney General Brownell demanding new trials in the Clinton Jencks case and all other cases where paid informers have been used as witnesses. Common justice, decency and humanity demand this.

ADOPT RESOLUTIONS in your trade union or civic organization against the use of the political informer system.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS

6 East 17 St. (Room 200), New York 3, N. Y.

I enclose my contribution of \$..... to help the fight against the use of informers, to defend their victims, and to uphold civil liberties.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

CONTRIBUTE NOW to Civil Rights Congress to help the fight against the use of informers, to defend their victims, and to uphold civil liberties



ACT NOW!

LET'S GET BACK TO THE BILL OF RIGHTS and let Americans freely speak their minds without fear of political informers!

Issued by CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS
6 East 17 St., New York 3, N. Y.

MATUSOW ADMITS LIES AGAINST 244

Some 'Aspect' of Testimony
False in Each Case, He Says
—All Invited to Reply

By RUSSELL BAKER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 2—Hervey Matusow declared today that he probably had lied about every person he ever testified against in Congressional hearings.

He also admitted, before ending three days on the witness stand, that he once had written a "vindictive and lying manuscript" about his career as a Government witness.

The "vindictive and lying" story, he insisted, had "nothing to do" with his later book, "False Witness," the tale of his career that touched off the Senate investigation.

Senator James O. Eastland.

New York Times, March 3, 1955

Mr. TAVENNER. I turn to the transcript of the testimony for the following day and again to a statement by Congressman Doyle where he puts into the record a statement handed to him by members of the official board of the 30th District Young Democrats of San Diego dated Tuesday, April 20, 1954, in which they say that the preparation of the paper was without approval of the executive board of that group.

Was the distribution of these papers connected with a meeting which you say was to be held that night, the first night?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the meeting which was to be attended by the Reverend A. A. Heist?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee just what occurred at that meeting?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Some of the Democratic executive board heard a little bit more about Mr. Heist and heard about the distribution of leaflets at this hall and they realized there was a little bit more to it than they had thought. They came to this meeting and persuaded Mr. Doyle to go with them to what he considered a legitimate Democratic meeting—didn't tell him what was going to happen at the meeting but they thought perhaps his presence there could save the situation.

When I arrived at the meeting the rest of the Democratic executive board informed me that I should let Reverend Heist speak for 10 minutes and then should let Congressman Doyle speak the rest of the time. I was faced with a room full of party members who had been subpoenaed, party lawyers from Los Angeles, leftwingers from San Diego. I don't think there was a single non-Progressive person present.

The Democratic executive board then made the mistake of turning it over to me as a good Communist Party member to handle the agenda after the business was taken—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they know at that time you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No. Nothing probably would have happened except in front of a bunch of Communist Party members who were that influential in the party I couldn't back down. Therefore I believe I explained the situation to the people in the audience, asked poor Congressman Doyle publicly if he would be willing to speak first since the other speaker was the scheduled speaker. Congressman Doyle got to his feet and gave a talk, I don't know how he did it, and then of course after he finished and left, Reverend Heist finished, blasting the committee. Everyone in the audience, of course, had been laughing at Representative Doyle and I think they were booing too.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, this was a putup job by the Communist Party on a member of this committee?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It certainly was, and I don't know how Representative Doyle could possibly give a talk. I don't know any other person who could get up under those circumstances and talk.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't know Representative Doyle. He can stand up under any circumstances.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Faced by an obvious audience of leftwingers like that who were laughing in his face.

The CHAIRMAN. But we have had experts do it. We do not mind them.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I was very proud of being a Democrat that night.

Mr. JACKSON. For the Republican Party, I thank you. I was afraid we were going to be completely excluded from this rally.

The CHAIRMAN. Speaking for the majority, I welcome that.

Mr. TAVENNER. These documents were paid for by the Communist Party, as I understand it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The documents, the stamps and the hall rental. The paper was furnished by the Independent Progressive Party. I think I paid for it out of Communist Party funds, but we mimeographed it and prepared most of it at the Independent Progressive Party office. David Starcevic helped me prepare it. We then took it to the Hillcrest Unitarian Center where members of that group folded and helped to address them.

Mr. TAVENNER. So all these various groups which you have testified to that were infiltrated by the Communist Party participated in this attack upon the committee which you have described. That is correct, isn't it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I would substitute for your word infiltrated, founded.

Mr. TAVENNER. What relationship was there between the 30,000 pamphlets prepared by the Committee for the Defense of the Bill of Rights and these documents which were delivered here at this building?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. There was no connection between them except that arrangements for distribution of both were made at the same meeting and I believe I copied most of the wording out of that first leaflet.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to dismiss the witness temporarily from the stand.

The CHAIRMAN. You are excused until recalled. You are still under subpoena.

Do you wish to call another witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Arthur Stevens.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR STEVENS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS, LOS ANGELES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman before I open my testimony I have a statement here which I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. You may file it and we will determine whether or not to make it a part of the record.

Mr. STEVENS. This is a very short statement and I would like to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is contrary to our rules.

Mr. STEVENS. We have been listening to stoolpigeons 2 days attack me and I should be given 5 minutes to read a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You may leave the statement here and we will determine whether or not to make it a part of the record.

Mr. STEVENS. Are you afraid to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Just leave it. We are not going to deviate from the rules of the committee for you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. STEVEN. Arthur Stevens.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Stevens?

Mr. STEVENS. Specifically I was born in Downers Grove, Ill., but I would like to add to that the day before yesterday was Independence Day and I was born in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and I hope to leave it that way, too, in spite of this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been?

Mr. STEVENS. Grammar school, high school, 4 years of college.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your employment?

Mr. STEVENS. I am unemployed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has your profession or trade been?

Mr. STEVENS. I have been a salesman most of my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. STEVENS. San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in San Diego?

Mr. STEVENS. Since the fall of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether the present address of the Community Unitarian Fellowship is 4561 North Avenue?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STEVENS. I will not discuss the Community Unitarian Fellowship or any other organization with this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a direction that the witness answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STEVENS. I recognize this question that you have just asked as one of your door-opening questions. You have one purpose only in asking me the question, which is to lead me into naming people and making me a stoopigeon and you are not going to get away with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. STEVENS. For that reason and others which I am going to give you I am going to decline to answer that question. And now I would like to have the courtesy of being able to give my reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you have any legal basis or legal grounds for refusing to answer the question I am sure the committee will hear you.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STEVENS. I will state the grounds for my refusal and you can rule on them later. In the first place, I am going to refuse to answer that question and all other questions like it on the basis of the first amendment, which guarantees to me the right of free speech, free press, free association, free religion. I believe that in this country we have the right of the secret ballot and I am not going to let you take it away from me.

My second reason for refusing to answer this question is that you know as well as I do that you are forbidden to investigate in areas where you are forbidden to legislate and this is clearly one of them. Your very act of asking me this question is a violation of my constitutional rights and the Supreme Court in May of this year in the Emspak and Quinn cases decided that and I know it. Chief Justice Warren—

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Witness—

Mr. STEVENS. I am going to give my reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not going to make a speech.

Mr. STEVENS. I am going to give my reasons in my own way.

Mr. JACKSON. As far as I am concerned, he is going to be ejected from the hearing room if he shows this obvious contempt toward a congressional committee.

Mr. STEVENS. I have nothing but contempt for this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. That is obvious.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not disturb us.

Mr. JACKSON. I would be alarmed if you were less contemptuous.

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind reading the cases that you mentioned.

What was that question, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question is whether or not the address of the Community Unitarian Fellowship is 4561 North Avenue, San Diego.

Mr. STEVENS. I have already told you that I am going to decline to answer that question. I now want to continue with my reasons and don't tell me whether they are legal or not until after I have given them. Now my third reason for refusing to answer this question is that this committee from its very inception has been an infringement—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, his answer is not responsive.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not an answer.

Mr. STEVENS. My fourth reason is that I heard a nauseous display here yesterday when you were obviously invading freedom of religion in spite of the smug disavowal of it by I think all three members of the committee. You were invading the freedom of religion and I am not going to stand here and let you get by with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. STEVENS. I haven't finished yet. My fifth reason for refusing to answer that question is that it is a violation of my rights under the fifth amendment. And I mean all of it. Not just part of it. I mean to use the fifth amendment in the way that it was intended to be used by our forefathers which was a protection from such bodies as this. My sixth reason—

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you decline to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you?

Mr. STEVENS. I have another reason that it is none of your business, the answer to this question. If you wish I will be very glad to leave voluntarily.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you would have much preferred not to have been here.

Mr. STEVENS. I didn't come here willingly, and I am not here to get the approval of this committee. I don't want it. It is the kiss of death.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stevens, are you familiar with any plan of the Communist Party or do you have knowledge regarding the plan of the Communist Party in San Diego to engage in Communist Party activities within the Community Unitarian Fellowship?

Mr. STEVENS. That is the same question. In other words I am simply not going to answer questions of that kind and I have given you my reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at a meeting of the San Diego Peace Forum at which Mrs. Schneider was made its chairman?

Mr. STEVENS. I am not going to answer any questions of this committee about political affiliations—associations, and I am certainly not going to match my word against that of a paid stool pigeon. I have given you the reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Mrs. Schneider is a good American and I resent what you have said because nobody would ever say that about you except a handful of people. Thank God so far it is only a handful.

Mr. STEVENS. I repeat it in spite of your resentment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Peter Hyun, the executive secretary of the Southern California Peace Crusade?

Mr. STEVENS. I have told you that I will not answer such questions and I repeat it now, same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with Peter Hyun regarding the functions that Mrs. Anita Schneider should perform in the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I have heard before that your hearing isn't very good, but I am going to tell you the same thing again that I simply will not answer such questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not?

Mr. STEVENS. For the same reasons. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will not give this committee any information that you may have regarding Communist Party activities in various front organizations?

Mr. STEVENS. I will not give this committee any information about my political affiliations, associations. I will not do it for the same reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Do you call your association with this peace group political?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STEVENS. I am not going to answer your question, Mr. Walter, but I would like to ask you one, if I could.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed. I will be willing to be sworn. I will make a deal with you. I will answer any question you ask me if you will answer only one question I ask you.

Mr. STEVENS. Very smart, Mr. Walter. Congratulations, but I am not going to take your bargain. The question I want to ask you is this—

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. STEVENS. Are you afraid to answer it?

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make a deal with you.

Mr. STEVENS. I will make no deal with you. I don't trust you.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to your coming to San Diego in 1950?

Mr. STEVENS. I lived at Pasadena.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in Pasadena?

Mr. STEVENS. I lived in Pasadena and Altadena for approximately 11 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in San Diego from 1950 up until 2 or 3 months ago?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Tavenner, you know there is a little song going around about Davy Crockett. He was supposed to be the greatest trapper of a hundred years or so ago and you are his logical successor. I would like to give you a coonskin hat, if you will accept it. It is a trappy question and I will not answer you. You know it. You have the same answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you expelled from the Communist Party within the last 30 or 60 days?

Mr. STEVENS. I am not going to answer that question, and you know it, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing further. You are excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. STEVENS. Are you willing to answer the question that I propose to you, Mr. Walter?

The CHAIRMAN. Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Mignon Jenkyns.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. JENKYNs. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. MIGNON JENKYNs, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Mignon Jenkyns. M-i-g-n-o-n J-e-n-k-y-n-s.

I have a statement also which I would like to file with the committee. I would like to read it but I don't imagine I can do so, so I will file it with the committee and any newsmen who want it. I have already sent copies to the two Vista papers where I live and asked them to be present at the hearing and I believe one of them is.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that you sought this publicity, don't you think perhaps we ought to televise these hearings? Then you wouldn't have to be bothered calling the press.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. I think they should be done away with altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not surprised at what you say.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted, Mrs. Jenkyns, that you are accompanied by the same counsel who appeared for the preceding witness.

Are you a native of the State of California?

Mrs. JENKYNs. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Jersey City, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to California?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Thirty-one or thirty-two years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made California your residence since that time?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Vista.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Graduated from Lincoln High School in Jersey City and Packard Business College in New York and various extension courses at the University of California at different times.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mrs. JENKYNs. Housewife, and that is one thing you can't take away from me. You can send me to jail, but you can't take my job away from me.

Mr. TAVENNER. No one is seeking to send you to jail.

Mrs. JENKYNs. Some jobs have been lost and that is one I can't lose.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Jenkyns, are you familiar with the organizational setup of the Independent Progressive Party in the northern part of San Diego County?

Mrs. JENKYNs. My understanding is that if I answer one question in that I have no right to use the fifth amendment and I don't know what you are going to ask me and I am afraid that I read accounts of other testimony—Bishop Oxnham, and so forth by this committee, and I am afraid you would trap me into something and I am going to refuse.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me explain fully what I have in mind so you will see what it is I want to inquire about.

The committee has heard evidence in Los Angeles, San Diego, and a number of other places of the activity of the Communist Party in the organizing of the Independent Progressive Party and in its functioning. The committee is endeavoring to make a study of what that participation was, what the Communist Party had in mind in trying to do that, if it did, and the method that it used. Now that is the reason I am asking you about your knowledge of the Independent Progressive Party in the northern section of this county.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. Well, I don't think you have the right to inquire about a political party and that, as I understand it, was a legal political party in California. I think that is the same as asking a person how he voted really. I don't think you should do that.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I am not interested in how you vote. I am interested in the activity of the Communist Party within the realm of politics, within the realm of religion, within the Government, within labor or within schools or any place we find it. There is no area that should be immune, there is no area in which the Communists should have a free reign to carry out their purpose without the Congress of the United States being permitted to inquire as to what the Communist Party objective is and how it is functioning.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was: Are you familiar with the organizational setup of the Independent Progressive Party in the northern area of this county? You said that you were afraid to answer the

question because you didn't know what the other questions would be. Now I have given you a fair idea as to what the other questions would be.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. Well, I am afraid I still don't trust you. That is an idea but I don't know what questions you are going to ask until you ask them. So I think I had better decline to discuss that at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you are uneasy about the question or uneasy about me, let me withdraw that question for the present.

Are you aware of any effort on the part of the Communist Party to dictate the policies of the Independent Progressive Party insofar as the northern area of San Diego County is concerned?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. I am not going to discuss anything about any political organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since 1951?

Mrs. JENKYNs. That comes under the same category, I would say, of questions about political activities and I could not answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is certainly not a political question.

Mr. JENKYNs. Of course that is your opinion, but I think if you go back far enough at one time the Communist Party was actually a legal party on the ballot, wasn't it, in California?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. JENKYNs. Wouldn't that make it political?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Congress of the United States defined what it considers, after having reviewed many, many years of investigative action of this and other committees, what the Communist Party is.

Mrs. JENKYNs. But you are the Congress of the United States. I agree with Dean Griswold, of Harvard, where he says these committees actually are the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. JENKYNs. A delegate represents the whole body. If I don't trust you then it means I at the moment can't trust the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Regardless of your distrust of Congress, will you answer the question, please?

Mrs. JENKYNs. No, I have said before that I won't.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask for a direction to the witness?

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer that question.

Mrs. JENKYNs. Then I claim the right not to answer it primarily under the first amendment, but just to be absolutely safe in this case the fifth amendment also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mrs. JENKYNs. That is the same, practically the same question, and the same answer.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your answer?

Mrs. JENKYNs. That I decline to answer under the fifth and the first.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in the Independent Progressive Party in the northern part of San Diego County?

Mrs. JENKYNs. That would come under the same category of those questions. I think in some cases those things are a matter of record;

aren't they? I am not sure whether it is a matter of record or not, as to what positions are held if you hold any position. I mean, for instance you can go down to the registrar of voters and find out how a person is registered. Whether or not you can find out whether or not a person held any particular position——

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question.

Mrs. JENKYNs. I stated it came under the category of the other questions and that I would refuse under the first and fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a member of the San Diego Peace Forum?

Mrs. JENKYNs. That comes under the same category of questions and I just——

The CHAIRMAN. Do you put the San Diego Peace Forum in the same category with the Communist Party and the Independent Progressive Party?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. JENKYNs. I put the question in the same category as being an inquiry into my private activities and private life.

The CHAIRMAN. I direct you to answer that question.

Mrs. JENKYNs. Well, I refuse under the first and fifth.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. You are excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Leo Lueb.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn? Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LUEB. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LEO C. LUEB, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. LUEB. I have a statement I would like to deliver, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. File it, please.

Mr. LUEB. The "stool pigeons" and "phonies" take up 2 or 3 days and file documents——

The CHAIRMAN. You may file it.

Mr. LUEB. I want to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not going to read it. You may leave it here.

Mr. LUEB. I will pass it to the press while I am here. You do something for democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name, please, sir.

Mr. LUEB. Leo C. Lueb. L-u-e-b.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by the same counsel who accompanied the preceding witnesses.

Mr. LUEB. I think he should be given the courtesy of stating his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. We know Mr. Margolis very well.

Mr. LUEB. I am proud he is my attorney.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Lueb?

Mr. LUEB. Born in the State of Kansas in 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in California?

Mr. LUEB. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. LUEB. I don't think that is pertinent or relevant to the questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask that the witness be directed to answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. LUEB. The committee has my address, I was served by the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask you where you live.

Mr. LUEB. City of San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. LUEB. On Imperial Avenue.

Mr. TAVENNER. What number, please?

Mr. LUEB. 3332. If you want my telephone number I will give that to you too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that in San Diego?

Mr. LUEB. It is.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in San Diego?

Mr. LUEB. Approximately about 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live prior to that?

Mr. LUEB. I lived in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in Los Angeles?

Mr. LUEB. Approximately 6 or 7 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in Los Angeles, or what was your occupation while there?

Mr. LUEB. You want to know what I was doing in Los Angeles or now? Be specific about these questions when you put them.

Mr. TAVENNER. I made it specific.

Mr. LUEB. They are confusing.

Mr. TAVENNER. I made it specific both as to time and place. Will you please answer the question.

Mr. LUEB. You notice I am handicapped and I cannot work; I lost my trade during the depression, lost my hand on a freight train.

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer.

Mr. LUEB. I am going to answer it but don't tell me how to answer it because the things I am going to say build up to the job I had. I was a news vendor. If you don't know what that is, it sells newspapers on the street.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you living in San Diego in 1953?

Mr. LUEB. I said I had been here 3 years. I guess you can multiply and subtract, can't you?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. LUEB. Go ahead.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1953 did you play any part in the formation of an organization known as the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. LUEB. You are getting Jim Crow now. You have been anti everything else. I guess it is time to get anti Jim Crow.

Mr. JACKSON. This is a very low order of contempt, Mr. Chairman. I have seen many much better.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you active in that organization?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer any questions pertaining to the Negro Labor Council. I think you know why. If you want me to say I will give the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The fifth amendment?

Mr. LUEB. Yes. Not for the reasons you think because I am guilty, because I am innocent of anything. I stand before this committee innocent and the only thing I am guilty of I am unemployed and if I have to have a job crawling on my belly before this committee I will remain unemployed.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not charged with anything.

Mr. LUEB. Why ask me these questions? Why was I drug up here?

The CHAIRMAN. Because we want to find out about some activities in this community and we know you can help us.

Mr. LUEB. I sure am not going to undermine the rights of the Negro people by sitting up here and having you attack them. I will tell you that. Any organization they might have and might not have.

Mr. JACKSON. What rights of the Negro people have been brought into question?

Mr. LUEB. The fact that you raise the question is the fact you attack the Negro.

Mr. JACKSON. That is wierd rationalization.

The CHAIRMAN. You ought to read Jackie Robinson's testimony about this committee, and what he doesn't say about your kind of people.

Mr. LUEB. If you are not a member of the Ku Klux Klan, you owe them money for back dues, you owe them money for not paying your past dues. You sure owe them money.

The CHAIRMAN. You made out an awfully good case for a change of the rules of the House of Representatives, so as to permit television. All people in the United States should see you testify.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree, Mr. Chairman. One of the best things that could happen in the fight against Communist aggression would be to see this witness on television.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Lee Major?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to name any people or discuss any people whatever, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you refuse to answer that question?

Mr. LUEB. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. On what grounds?

Mr. LUEB. On the ground of the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer at any time with Verna Langer regarding work in the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds so previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1953 in San Diego County?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer any question pertaining to the Communist Party on the grounds so previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of any Communist Party plans to be active in the Negro Labor Council?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer any questions, I just told you, pertaining to the Communist Party on the grounds so previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that question directed to his membership in the Communist Party or the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question in substance was whether or not he was aware of any Communist Party plans to become active within the National Negro Labor Council. Were you aware of the existence of the plan on the part of the Communist Party to direct the affairs of the Independent Progressive Party in San Diego at any time after 1951?

Mr. LUEB. Would you mind stating that question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware of the existence of any Communist Party plan to influence the conduct of the affairs of the Independent Progressive Party of San Diego?

Mr. LUEB. I told you, I refuse to answer any questions pertaining to the Communist Party whatever on the grounds so previously stated, regardless of how you word them I am going to refuse to answer them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you decided you will not give this committee any information relating to Communist Party activities in this area, the methods used by the Communist Party or the extent of its work in this area?

Mr. LUEB. You are really working this thing around but it comes back to the same thing all the time. I told you I wasn't going to answer any questions regardless of how you word them about the Communist Party, regardless of the way it is worded.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LUEB. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when in Los Angeles?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since you moved to San Diego?

Mr. LUEB. I moved here in 1952. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party in San Diego at any time since you moved here in 1952?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer any question pertaining to the Communist Party on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you refuse to answer that question?

Mr. LUEB. I refuse to answer that one; that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

The witness is excused.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes. (Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Schneider.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANITA BELL SCHNEIDER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Schneider, you have previously identified in the course of your testimony Mr. Leo Lueb, I think, as a member of the Communist Party. Isn't that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not he was a functionary of any character of the National Negro Labor Council?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Not to my knowledge. The National Negro Labor Council, no, he was one of the organizers assigned to the local Negro Labor Council in San Diego.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the matter I am referring to.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he an organizer of the local group of the National Negro Labor Council in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, if you know, how he became interested or at least if he became interested in that work.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I know something of the background of the beginning of the Negro Labor Council. It was originally organized in San Diego by a non-Communist Party member. This non-Communist Party member had been attending meetings in Los Angeles and had met the regional organizer of the Negro Labor Council there. She had persuaded him to start a chapter of the Negro Labor Council in San Diego. When he returned to San Diego he sent out invitations to people to come to his home to organize the Negro Labor Council chapter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Mr. Lueb? Of whom are you speaking when you speak of "he sent"?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. A non-Communist Party member.

Mr. TAVENNER. A non-Communist Party member of the National Negro Labor Council.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. This non-Communist Party member was active in the Independent Progressive Party here in San Diego. He just accidentally met someone from the Negro Labor Council in Los Angeles and came back and started to organize a local Negro Labor Council chapter here. He sent out the invitations; 10 or 12 people attended the first meeting. I was one of the people who attended that meeting. I discussed this later with Verna Langer at my regular Communist club meeting. I was informed at that time, we had had an election of officers already, I believe, when I attended my Communist club meeting. The non-Communist Party member had been elected chairman of the group following regular Communist Party procedure of electing a non-Communist Party member alternate or somebody who was not known as a Communist Party member as head of a group or as a front for it. Two other people elected to office in Negro Labor Council then were Lee and Beverly Major. Leo Lueb was given the job of organizer and offered to help in every way possible. I discussed the situation with Verna Langer at our Communist club meeting. She said it had not been their original intention to start a Negro Labor Council chapter in San Diego, that after all it looked awfully silly with 9 white people and 3 Negro people present organizing a Negro Labor Council chapter, particularly since most of the white Communist Party members present were not union members and were not connected in any way with the labor situation.

She said, however, it had been decided necessary since the chapter was being started to control the chapter, to control its activities, and for that reason we and Beverly Major had been elected officers and Leo Lueb had been appointed to the group to help organize it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it successful in its field of operation?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No, it wasn't. With the halfhearted Communist Party support behind it, it failed very quickly. There were very few non-Communist Negro people in San Diego and those of them that were non-Communist were not interested in this type of a group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you restate that please?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. In San Diego there were very few, I don't know how to put it exactly—it was impossible to attract non-Communist Negro people to this group, this type of group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee any idea as to how long it continued as an organized group—that is, the local chapter of the National Negro Labor Council?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't remember exactly. I do remember it continued until the national conference of the National Negro Labor Council and we sent two delegates. We sent the non-Communist Party member and Beverly Major as our delegates to the national convention in Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Beverly Major a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am informed that convention was in December 1953?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long was it after that convention that this local group in San Diego continued to function as an organized group?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. At the moment I can't recall any meetings after that date, after the national convention. There were only a few meetings of the organization. We had quite a few dinners and money raising affairs getting the money to send the delegates to Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then this organization was unsuccessful in this area?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the earlier part of your testimony you referred to two students at the university with you, one of whom had been sent to an Oregon University.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you identify him in your testimony as a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't remember whether I did or not. He was. He was instrumental in recruiting me into the Communist Party in the beginning. His name is Ralph Friedman, F-r-i-e-d-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he has attended any other schools in addition to San Diego State College and Oregon Teachers College?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. University of Oregon. I don't remember now whether he had. I know he had something like 8 years of schooling behind him, he told me at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he engage in any Communist Party activities that you can recall in San Diego off the campus of the college?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. He attended many Communist-front meetings. At the time I was acquainted with him he was writing articles for one of the magazines. I don't know of any other Communist Party activity aside from recruiting me that he did engage in.

Mr. TAVENNER. You told us in the beginning of your testimony that in addition to your Communist Party assignments in mass organiza-

tions or front organizations which you have already described, that you were assigned to the Civil Rights Congress. Will you tell the committee, please, to what extent the Communist Party was interested in the Civil Rights Congress and what it did about it? Tell the committee what you know about it.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I attended the Civil Rights Congress workshop in Los Angeles in November and December of 1954. During that time Frank Spector was one of the speakers. He told us about the history of the Civil Rights Congress, of the International Labor Defense, and of the Industrial Workers of the World group that had preceded it. He pointed out the errors in the Industrial Workers of the World committees. He pointed out the successes in the International Labor Defense. When someone in the audience asked him why the International Labor Defense had been dissolved he said there was political expediency, that it was no longer an effective organization and for that reason it was dissolved and reorganized, new officers elected and it became the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been so cited by the Attorney General of the United States and by this committee as being the successor of the International Labor Defense, both being Communist-front organizations.

Will you tell the committee, please, how the Communist Party in San Diego functioned in relation to the Civil Rights Congress here?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Miriam Starcevic was the executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress at the time I joined. A non-Communist Party member had been elected chairman of the committee following the familiar Communist Party platform of electing respectable non-Communist Party members as head of the organization wherever possible. Miriam Starcevic received her directions from Los Angeles, most of the time from Marguerite Robinson, and part of the time from Emil Freed and part of the time from Dave Brown.

Mr. TAVENNER. All three of those persons have been identified as members of the Communist Party, have they not?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they have. Miriam Starcevic had several small children and as it was difficult for her to travel to Los Angeles to receive her directions, Marguerite Robinson made periodic visits to the San Diego area where she called executive board meetings to give them their directions.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what way did the local Communist Party assist the Civil Rights Congress in its work?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The local Communist Party would discuss the officers of the Civil Rights Congress previous to their election, would decide who was to be elected to what job, they would decide when the elections would be held and where, they would decide who was to speak and what was to be done, every detail was decided by the Communist Party previous to the Civil Rights Congress meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand in effect your testimony is that the Communist Party in San Diego during the time you were an FBI agent in it had sufficient numerical and other strength so that it determined who should be the officers of the Civil Rights Congress in San Diego, and that the Communist Party dictated the program of the Civil Rights Congress in San Diego; is that correct?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is exactly correct, Congressman Doyle.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what projects the Communist Party succeeded in having the Civil Rights Congress accept or to engage in?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. When I first joined the Communist Party and the Civil Rights Congress, Communist Party leaders were being tried under the Smith Act. At that time most operations in front organizations were suspended completely for defense of the people being tried under the Smith Act. That was true in the Civil Rights Congress also. The San Diego Emergency Defense Committee was formed; people were sent to the Civil Rights Congress picket line in Los Angeles; and money was being raised in every possible way to defend the Communist leaders charged under the Smith Act.

MR. TAVENNER. Incidentally, let me go back to the work of the Independent Progressive Party. Did it engage in any activity aimed at the defense of the Smith Act?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I can remember taking minutes of the county central committee meeting during that time when the San Diego emergency defense committee was discussed in detail and plans were made for it. The effort to defend people under the Smith Act was carried out in each of the front organizations in exactly the same way.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that the primary consideration or interest of the Communist Party at that time, to afford a defense and protection to its own members?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

MR. TAVENNER. Therefore you find these various organizations taking up the same fight. Were there any other causes that the Civil Rights Congress sponsored in which its decision was affected or in which its decision resulted from prior decisions made by the Communist Party?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes, there was activity undertaken in the Rosenberg case; there was activity undertaken in the Emory Collier case, and the Wesley Wells case. Those are the only groups I can recall at the moment.

MR. TAVENNER. Let's begin with the Wells case. To what extent did the Communist Party participate in a decision by the Civil Rights Congress to sponsor the Wells case?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. They determined completely the activities of the Civil Rights Congress in that case, particularly in our local Wells committee. At the very end I was appointed as the go-between between the Communist Party members and the non-Communist Party members and all of my directions, all of my activity, was done at the direction of the Communist Party.

MR. TAVENNER. Tell the committee, please, all that you can now recall as to how the work of that organization was carried out.

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Do you mean in the Wesley Wells case?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes, in the Wesley Wells case.

MRS. SCHNEIDER. The Wesley Wells case was discussed many times at Civil Rights Congress meetings, among them at the national executive board meeting of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago in 1952. It was explained to us there that the Wesley Wells case had been a Civil Rights Congress case for some years, the man had been in San Quentin. However, he had attacked a guard and had been sentenced to death. Since then I am not absolutely positive on my dates but we discussed the past history of the case. It was explained to us the

Civil Rights Congress had undertaken the defense over a period of years. Ida Rothstein of the San Francisco Civil Rights Congress had been particularly active in the case. After that time I don't remember the dates on this; when Wesley Wells had been sentenced to death for attacking the guard the Civil Rights Congress decided to change its methods of operation in the same way that the Communist Party had decided to change the methods of operation of each of the Communist-front groups.

The Communist Party had decided that instead of working either as an open Communist Party or through the Communist-front groups it should work through the other mass organizations, it should work through existing churches or political parties, other groups aside from—

Mr. TAVENNER. The same as you have demonstrated the Communist Party did in San Diego from 1951 on to 1955?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Exactly. In this case you see the Civil Rights Congress had fought as a front group in the defense of Wesley Wells up until the time he was sentenced to death. It was felt a change of operation then was advisable, that only by infiltrating church groups, other political groups, by activating other people, could the case be defended any longer. They did so. A non-Communist Los Angeles minister who had absolutely no idea of the people who were prompting his activity was interested in the case. I think even Walter Winchell was activated, who certainly is a non-Communist.

The change in the method of operation was successful and through operating in other groups the Communist Party and Civil Rights Congress accomplished its objective.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then after that time did another case occur, the Collier case?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Emory Collier. It occurred before that time, in December or January 1951 or 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was the action in that case initiated? Where did it begin?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. An ex-Communist Party member was living in the frontier housing area and found out that this young Negro man had been charged with four charges of rape. He brought the case to the Civil Rights Congress meeting and suggested that the Civil Rights Congress take the case. It was discussed within the Civil Rights Congress and within the Communist Party. It was then referred to Los Angeles.

Marguerite Robinson and I believe Emil Freed at that time decided that it was a very good Civil Rights Congress case. They came to San Diego and set up a committee, the Emory Collier defense committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that committee set up without anybody knowing whether or not the accused was guilty or innocent—without knowing anything about the facts in the case?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the question of whether or not this individual was guilty come up in the conferences in the Communist Party or the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, it did. It was discussed many times. It got to be rather a problem. In the Communist Party it was decided that whether the man was guilty or innocent had absolutely nothing to do with it. It made an excellent case for propaganda for the Communist

Party and therefore it should be taken as a Civil Rights Congress case. The outcome of the case had nothing to do with undertaking defense. It was an excellent method of propagandizing non-Communist people.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say that this matter was presented to the Civil Rights Congress and the Communist Party. Can you throw any light on what part the Communist Party played, if any, in having the Civil Rights Congress adopt this case or to take it up as an issue.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It determined it completely. I went to Los Angeles with other members of the Communist Party and with I believe, one non-Communist, to discuss the case with Marguerite Robinson in Los Angeles who was a Communist Party member. We discussed the case there and the guilt or innocence had nothing to do with their taking the case.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of the work done by the Civil Rights Congress after it did adopt this case? What did it do about it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. First the man who was charged with the crimes was approached but he refused to do anything. He had consulted the race relations organization and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Both of them—they are non-Communist organizations—advised him very strongly against cooperating with the Civil Rights Congress. I know he was in one case warned that if he allowed the Civil Rights Congress to defend him their organization could not give him help; that they would give him help otherwise.

At first Emory Collier said he didn't want the help of the Civil Rights Congress, but according to Marguerite Robinson in Los Angeles, an Emory Collier defense committee was set up which was not quite as obviously a leftwing organization. Emory Collier was willing to accept the help of that organization since Communist Party members were taking his wife out and collecting money to pay their attorney.

Mr. TAVENNER. But actually the new organization for the defense of Collier was established by the same group which had tried to represent him?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, with one exception. Following the familiar pattern again a non-Communist Party member was again elected chairman of the committee. We met at her home. But the organizational work was carried on by exactly the same members who were active in the Civil Rights Congress before. We got all of our directions from the regional Civil Rights Congress in Los Angeles. The attorney who was corresponding secretary for the Emory Collier Defense Committee panel of attorneys.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you occupy any position in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I did in the Emory Collier Defense Committee. I was corresponding secretary for the Emory Collier defense committee. I was also delegated to make reports for the Emory Collier Defense Committee to the Civil Rights Congress, directly to the Civil Rights Congress meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was the money raised to finance these projects?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Much of the money was raised by going to Communist Party members or leftwingers and liberals in the community; explaining the case to them; taking them leaflets; and asking them for money. Some of the money was raised by having dinners; and some of it was raised by a song contest. Some of it was raised by going to the Negro churches in the community. There the people attending the

church were given leaflets explaining the case on their way into the church. On their way out the Communist Party members in the group would be standing outside with big labels and woven baskets to collect the money to pay the attorneys' fees for the case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any idea how much money was raised for this and similar purposes by the Civil Rights Congress in San Diego?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I know it was many thousands of dollars. Our quota for the original San Diego emergency defense committee, if I am not mistaken, was \$3 500. I remember at one time passing the \$1,400 mark, which was our quota. I am not absolutely positive that every cent was raised.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was this case tried?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Emory Collier defense case was tried in San Diego. I don't remember which court. Superior court, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether it was the practice to remit all the funds raised and contributed to the cause for which it was intended?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. In this case it was not. The committee raised a lot of money, the attorneys' fees were not paid, I was told afterwards, the bail bondsman was not paid although the money was voted for that cause.

Mr. TAVENNER. When this money was raised by members of the Communist Party and by people who contributed at the solicitation of members of the Communist Party, what disposition was made of it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. No explanation was given to the Civil Rights Congress concerning it. However, in one case we had several dinners, we had a series of dinners for the emergency defense committee. Part of the money was to be retained in San Diego for the Civil Rights Congress; part of it was to be sent to Los Angeles. However, I can remember having a report made with about \$16 left in the treasury and no expenses having been paid out of the Civil Rights Congress during that time. The money was not in the treasury of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am trying to get at is this: whether or not the money was solicited by the Communist Party or the Civil Rights Congress for that matter for a special cause; whether there was any plan in existence by which a part of the funds were to be retained either for use of the Communist Party or for use of the Civil Rights Congress as the case may be.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, part of the money was to be retained for the use of the Civil Rights Congress theoretically but the money did not remain in the treasury.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now in regard to the Communist Party, do you recall funds being raised for special purposes like the Smith Act; that is, for the defense of the Smith Act defendants?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I can remember a series of socials being given, primarily socials during that time, in defense of the leaders of the Communist Party. I don't remember the exact amounts raised now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether it was the plan of the Communist Party to send all the proceeds to the cause for which they were donated or whether in those instances a part or percentage was supposed to be kept for general Communist Party purposes.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. We were told that a percentage was to be kept. I was not told the amount of the percentage.

Mr. TAVENNER. So if a person who was not a member of the Communist Party was solicited by the Communist Party to make a contribution to a cause that he was very much interested in or believed in, all of his donation wouldn't go to that cause; part of it would go to the Communist Party, to which he may be very much opposed?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that a correct analysis of it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. That is exactly correct. I can give you an example of that. That occurred in the San Diego Peace Forum. It sounds very unimportant and it probably is but it is an example of the methods of operation. Toward the end of our peace-forum meetings we would vote on sending a telegram, for example, to the President or a telegram to Senator McCarthy or something and we would pass the hat to collect enough nickels and dimes and pennies to pay for the telegram. As I was chairman, the money was often turned over to me to send the telegram. Mr. Leo Lueb, as a matter of fact, was the Communist Party member that discussed that with me after one of the meetings. He criticized me very much. He said it wasn't correct Communist Party method of operation. He said it was up to the heads, it was up to the Communist Party organizer within the organization to decide how the money collected would be spent. In this case although it was about \$1.87, an air mail letter would accomplish exactly the same thing and the money that was saved was to be used for the purpose that I would want to put it to, not the purpose that it was given to the peace forum for.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean put it to the Communist Party purposes that you wanted to put it?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes. I can give you another example of that if you want. This is a case that came up before this committee a year ago last April when Laura Colwell Smith testified. She said that one of her acquaintances had died and left a large sum of money to her. He had said exactly what the money was to be spent for and she said she did exactly what he told her to do with the money. There was over \$10,000, I know. She said she even took his pocket watch to the Russian Embassy in San Francisco, according to his instructions, because he wanted the watch to be returned to the Soviet Union. He wanted it to be kept in the Soviet Union. The Communist Party criticized Laura Smith very much for this. It was incorrect procedure. After the money had been willed to her she should have turned over the money to the Communist Party. Since she had not, she was guilty of stealing from the Communist Party and she was expelled from the Communist Party for that reason. She said she then went up to Los Angeles and sat in the Communist Party office for hours all one day asking for a hearing, but they refused to give her a hearing. She told me about it. She was applying for readmittance into the Communist Party last November. It shows how flexible the Communist Party ideas of ethics are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, that is very interesting. Mr. Doyle was a member of the subcommittee that was here in April 1954 and may recall this incident. We subpoenaed this person before the committee. We had introduced in evidence the will of the individual in question. We had also introduced in evidence the court settlements

made in the settlement of the estate involved. The will provided for the payment of the income from an estate of around \$28,000 to a daughter of the testator during her lifetime and after her death this money was to be distributed equally among three persons, William Schneiderman, Dr. V. A. K. Tashjian, who had been the subject of a great deal of testimony before this committee in Los Angeles, and Emily Hillkowitz. Seeing that the money was payable to Schneiderman and Tashjian or at least two-thirds of it, we were interested in knowing whether or not it was for the benefit of the Communist Party. There was a codicil to the will, however, which changed the beneficiaries and made the money payable to Laura Colwell Smith, the person to whom the witness has now referred and to Elizabeth Rowe.

MR. DOYLE. I remember that evidence and testimony very clearly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAVENNER. We produced evidence here that Laura Colwell Smith received in the settlement on one occasion \$5,000 and \$8,000 on another occasion besides the tangible personal property. She refused to testify as to what had become of the money except to say the same thing was done with the money as was done with the money that the others were to receive under this will. Now we learn from this witness that she admitted to her, that is, Laura Colwell Smith, that she paid this money over to the Russian Embassy.

MRS. SCHNEIDER. No; that is not correct. She didn't say exactly what was done about the money. She did say that she had gone to the Russian Embassy in San Francisco and had turned over the watch.

MR. TAVENNER. Only the watch?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Didn't she say anything about the money?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. No, she didn't. She said, however, that she had done exactly what he directed her to do with it.

MR. TAVENNER. Then she was expelled from the Communist Party because she didn't turn this money over to the Communist Party?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they said she had stolen it from the Communist Party because she had not turned it over to them.

MR. TAVENNER. We were discussing the method used by the Communist Party in the handling of funds solicited and collected by solicitations. Can you at this time recall any instances where a part of funds collected was retained for general Communist Party purposes in San Diego while the rest of it was sent on to the purpose for which it was contributed? Is there any other instance that comes to your mind?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Not right at this moment.

MR. TAVENNER. You spoke of the Rosenberg defense. Were funds collected in this area for that purpose?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. Yes; they were both before the execution of the Rosenbergs and afterward for the support of their children.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you recall if the Communist Party was also connected in any way with the Sobell defense?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. I don't know whether there was a connection or not. Money was collected for the Sobell defense.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that done by the Communist Party or the Civil Rights Congress or by whom?

MRS. SCHNEIDER. I do know a meeting was at my house but it got a little bit involved as many of the Communist-front activities did. Originally it started out to be an Independent Progressive Party social

at my house for money-raising purposes. However, someone telephoned from Los Angeles—I don't know who—explaining that the national secretary for the Sobell defense was available and would like to speak in San Diego on the same date as our money-raising social and asked to speak at that meeting. Norma Aronson, I believe her name was. She came to the meeting with the representative from the Los Angeles Sobell Defense Committee and spoke. The money from that meeting was turned over to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was that Los Angeles representative?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I have it on file but I don't have the name with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether all of the money raised for that purpose was turned over to that individual or part of it retained?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The expenses of the meeting were taken out. I don't know what happened to the rest.

The CHAIRMAN. It has come to this committee's attention that the same people are using the same Rosenberg cause to collect money and are still collecting money.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, they were when I left San Diego in January.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told the committee about your attendance at a national conference of the Independent Progressive Party in Chicago in 1952. Did you, in connection with that trip, attend any other meetings?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I attended the national executive board meeting of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago which was held immediately after the Independent Progressive Party convention there.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as you know did anything occur at that convention that would be of interest to this committee?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. It was an extremely eventful conference and many decisions were made on a national basis which governed the entire activities of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. I was referring particularly to your own activity. I didn't make that plain, I know, but did you receive any advice or instruction that related to you?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Yes, I did. One of the national directors of the Civil Rights Congress, Aubrey Grossman, was present, Marguerite Robinson was also present. Marguerite Robinson was urging me to become a full-time Communist Party organizer working in the Civil Rights Congress. She was discussing that with Aubrey Grossman in my presence. Aubrey Grossman said that her suggestion was very incorrect. He said that since it had been decided by the local group that I should be chairman of the San Diego Peace Forum it was incorrect for her politically to ask for a transfer for me to the Civil Rights Congress. He said it was just like robbing your own till. You were taking money out of your own pocket. That was a local decision after all. Marguerite Robinson told him he might be able to tell her what to do; give her orders to do as far as strategy went. He might be able to tell her on that basis what to do but in her own region it was up to her to make those decisions and he couldn't control that for her.

After we returned to San Diego it was discussed by the local Communist Party whether I should transfer to the Civil Rights Congress or not. It was decided that I should not be transferred. Marguerite Robinson was told her directions operated as far as telling her what to

do and the method of carrying them out remained in the local Communist Party. If it had been decided locally I was chairman of the Peace Forum, that was it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Between the period of 1951 and 1955 when you were active in the Communist Party in San Diego, was any effort made by the Communist Party to support patriotic measures and movements in this area, such as Red Cross drives? There have been campaigns for many other things. Do you recall whether or not there were campaigns of that character conducted?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Exactly the reverse. I can remember at one time Dorothy Kykyri was very ill. She needed several blood transfusions. The other party members were urged to go down and contribute their blood to be given to Dorothy Kykyri. I don't know, there is a method of balancing, you give so many pints and she gets half of it, I think. I went down but I had given blood too recently and they wouldn't take it. I explained that at my Communist Party meeting, a meeting with Verna Langer. Verna Langer asked me what I had been doing, giving blood to the Red Cross at that time? She said after all it would be given to a soldier in South Korea and I had to remember after all which side I was on.

Mr. DOYLE. Did she refer to a soldier of the United States or of the United Nations troops that happened to be in South Korea?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. She was referring strictly to the United States soldier. Another item I can remember, after the end of the Korean war the Peace Crusade was at a loss. In order to keep the Peace Crusade in operation it needed a new issue to work on, a new national issue. It was suggested to oppose John Foster Dulles: get out a blackening campaign against John Foster Dulles. I came up with one suggestion that was vetoed promptly. I thought if we put on a major clothing drive all over the United States for clothing for the North and South Korean children, particularly that it may be a very good thing for the peace movement, it would be possible to explain to the people involved how bad war was for the people in general. I suggested that at a Peace Forum workshop meeting to Peter Hyun and also to Bernadette Doyle, whom I had gone to see with Verna Langer, the head of the Communist Party in this area.

Bernadette Doyle said no, that it wasn't politically correct. If we gave clothing to the South Korean children as well as to North Korean children it would cut down on the expenses of the United States Government. If the United States Government had to furnish clothing to these children it would cut down on the amount of money that it would have to spend for defense and for other projects.

Therefore, it was advisable that no clothing be sent to the South Korean children or to the North Korean children because it would cost the United States Government money to furnish it otherwise. Every child in Korea could freeze if it was going to cost the United States Government money.

Mr. TAVENNER. Throughout your period of membership in the Communist Party in San Diego—and that was during the period of time in which there have been many conflicts between the foreign policy of the United States and that of the Soviet Union—have you observed any inclination on the part of the Communist Party to side with the United States on those issues where they were in conflict with the interests of the Soviet Union?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I had difficulty when I first went into the Communist Party because I had no background in Marxist theory. When issues would come up I didn't know how a Communist Party member should react. Each time all I had to do was decide which was to the advantage of the Soviet Union and the disadvantage of the United States and conduct myself accordingly. I was never in error. I remember in particular the issue of universal military training came up. We hadn't been given any instructions on that particular point. It would be to the disadvantage of the Soviet Union for us to have universal military training, it would be to the military advantage of this country. Therefore the Peace Forum opposed universal military training. It was perfectly correct when we received our instructions from the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question: Didn't you ever hear any Communist Party functionary in San Diego either who lived in San Diego or came to San Diego from Los Angeles or elsewhere, did you ever hear any of these top Communist functionaries speak out in Communist meetings in favor of the foreign policy of the United States?

I ask it from you as an experienced Communist to bring out the point that I am interested in. Did you ever hear of that?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Very much to the contrary. People in this country aren't quite correct. Everybody here in the United States I think has the idea that if you really ask a Communist Party member, if you gave him the chance of returning to the Soviet Union he would prefer staying in this country. That isn't correct. Based on their ideological background, the people that I knew in the Communist Party had a very deep personal affection for the Soviet Union. When Stalin died they mourned. President Eisenhower could die and they wouldn't give a darn.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand by that you mean that there are people in our society who would like to go to Russia?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. I don't know any Communist Party members, if they were given the opportunity and if the Soviet Union would accept them, who wouldn't go.

The CHAIRMAN. Who would not go?

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They would go. They have a real personal feeling about it. If a war would break out they wouldn't change their minds. They are on the other side.

Mr. DOYLE. That would be a good solution.

The CHAIRMAN. I was wondering whether it wouldn't be a smart move for us to introduce legislation providing money for them to go. [Applause.]

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. They would have an excuse.

The CHAIRMAN. They wouldn't go.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. The Soviet Union, they would say, wouldn't take them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is probably true because the Soviet Union would be afraid that the dissatisfaction of these people would be great and they would immediately start telling the people over there of the advantages of the terrible capitalist system in the United States, thereby committing a crime against the state. Actually, I am very much in favor of the interchange of people. I am largely responsible

for permitting various delegations to come in. The only fear that our people have is there might be some untoward demonstration or somebody might be injured and create an incident. We are very proud of what those delegations see here. Maybe the smart thing for us to do is to let them all come, anybody that wants to, at our expense.

Mr. TAVENNER, do you have anything further?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that about covers the questions that I had proposed to ask. If it were not so late I would go further. But I believe this is essentially all I desire to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to take this opportunity to say to the witness that it is impossible to evaluate the service that you have rendered your country in this cold war. I know all kinds of Communists and I am sure that you do. Unfortunately, there are many people in America who do not and it is only because brave, patriotic people such as yourself who made the sacrifice that you made over a long period of time that more people have become aware of what this conspiracy is and what it means to America and, as I said before, your contribution in this cold war in which we are now engaged, is considerable.

You are entitled to the thanks not only of this subcommittee, which is performing a distasteful task—one that none of us sought—there isn't a man on this committee or this subcommittee who sought membership on it. You are entitled to our thanks and the thanks of the Congress of the United States and of all of the American people, even those people who disagree with you, because some day they will have the courage that Winston Burdett had, the radio commentator, and they will see the error of their ways and perhaps be willing to make the same kind of a contribution you have made.

I want to also thank Sheriff Strand, and Deputy Sheriff Newsom, for their splendid cooperation and the Chamber of Commerce for its assistance, and to all of the people who have made it possible for us in the way that the Congress had devised to bring to the people of this community some understanding of a phase of this problem.

With that the meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:40 p. m., the committee recessed subject to call.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Horace	1913, 1982
Arnold, Vaida (Mrs.)	1999
Aronson, Norma	2038
Bayne, Carol	1926
Beilew, Minna K	1952, 1953
Berman, Jack	1913, 1999
Biberman, Herbert	1960, 1978–1981
Brown, Dave	2031
Callendar, Carl	1983
Carpadakis, John	2004
Cerney, Isobel	1913, 1951, 1957
Collier, Emory	2032–2034
Dodd, Bella V	1989
Doyle, Bernadette	1913, 2039
Du Bois, W. E. B.	1919, 2001
Dugdale, Bert Q.	1961, 1962, 1971–1974 (testimony), 1983, 2004
Dugdale, Helen (Mrs. Bert Q. Dugdale)	1914, 1915, 1961, 1962, 1983
Edwards, Carmen	1910, 1984, 2004
Elston, Laura Stevenson	1982
Fast, Howard	1949
Forrey, Eddie	1977
Freed, Emil	2031, 2033
Freedman, Robert	1948
Friedman, Ralph	2030
Fritchman, Stephen H.	1923
Fouts, Alberta	1983
Garlin, Sender	1913, 1917
Gibson, Howard	1917, 1983
Gibson, Lolita (Mrs. Howard Gibson)	1910, 1911, 1914, 1915, 1917, 1918, 1922, 1926, 1982, 1983, 2002, 2004, 2005
Graham, Shirley (Mrs. W. E. B. Du Bois)	1919
Green, Abner	1960
Grossman, Aubrey	1913, 2038
Gue, Stanley M.	1938–1947 (testimony)
Hagen, O. B.	1983
Hamill, Frank	2007, 2009
Hamlin, Lloyd	1959, 1984
Hardyman, Hugh	1928, 1937, 1954, 1955, 1957
Heist, A. A.	2009, 2017
Hicks, Harry	1922
Hicks, Mrs. Harry	1922
Hillkowitz, Emily	2037
Hinchliffe, Jo Ann	2000
Hyun, Alice	1919
Hyun, Peter	1917, 1918, 1920, 1923, 1928–1930, 1952, 1954, 1978, 2021, 2039
Jacques, Charles	1983, 2004
Jacques, Elsie	1983, 2000, 2002
Jenkyns, Mignon	1983, 2000, 2006, 2022–2025 (testimony)
Joy, Ned	1943
Kahn, Albert	1960
Kenny, Ann	1985
Kerner, William	1918
Kingsbury, John	1913, 1916, 1930, 1936, 1955–1957, 1962
Kingsbury, Mrs. John	1962

	Page
Kirby, Bernard	1943
Kusnierczyk, Miriam	2000
Kykyri, Dorothy (Mrs. John Kykyri)	1914, 1937, 1976, 1998, 2000, 2010, 2039
Kykyri, John	1914, 1937, 1961, 1967, 1968–1971 (testimony), 1998, 2000, 2004, 2009
Langdon, June	1977, 2008
Langer, Joseph	1983
Langer, Verna	1911, 1914, 1915, 1922, 1925–1928, 1936, 1948, 1958, 1959, 1961, 1970, 1977, 1981–1938, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2027, 2029, 2039
Leonard, Alvin R.	1943
Lessner, Milton	2004, 2007
Lueb, Bess	1983
Lueb, Leo C.	1955, 1983, 2004, 2025–2028 (testimony), 2029, 2036
Magil, A. B.	1913
Major, Beverly	2029, 2030
Major, Lee	2008, 2027, 2029
Margolis, Ben	1965–1974, 2010, 2018, 2022, 2025
Marion, George	1928
Miner, Laura (or Minor)	1922, 1924, 1925
Moos, Elizabeth	1930, 1949, 1950, 1956
Morford, Richard	1936
Mucha, Reva	1930, 1936, 1937, 1978
Newsom, Robert S.	1909, 1910
Orel, Ben	1913
Patterson, William	1913
Pritt, D. N.	1949
Remington, William Walter	1949
Roberts, Holland	1962, 1964
Robinson, Marguerite	2031, 2033, 2034, 2038
Rosen, Obed (Whitey)	1926, 2007–2009
Rothstein, Ida	2033
Rowe, Elizabeth	2037
Rubens, Bill	1983
Russell, Maud	1913, 1923, 1924
Rykoff, Richard	1915, 1979
St. John, Clinton	2010
Samson, Peter	1922–1924, 1928, 1945
Schneider, Anita Bell (Mrs. Virgil A. Schneider; alias Seeta)	1908–1938 (testimony), 1947–1964 (testimony), 1975–1984 (testimony), 1997– 2006 (testimony), 2006–2018 (testimony), 2021, 2028–2041 (testi- mony).
Schneiderman, William	1914, 2037
Shermis, Celia (Mrs. Harry Shermis)	1914, 1915, 1922, 1926, 1927, 1948, 1961, 1964, 1965–1968 (testimony), 1977, 1984, 1996, 2000, 2006
Shermis, Harry	1984
Siskind, Edith (Mrs. Henry Siskind)	1978
Siskind, Henry	1978
Sleeth, Paul	1976, 1984, 2008
Smith, Laura Colwell	1984, 2036, 2037
Spector, Frank	1913, 2031
Starcevic, David (Dave)	1983, 1984, 2007, 2008, 2018
Starcevic, Miriam	1914, 1915, 1983, 1984, 2004, 2031
Steinberg, Beatrice (Mrs. Henry Steinberg)	1917, 1918
Steinberg, Henry	1918
Steinmetz, Harry	1922, 1941–1943, 1955, 1976, 1984–1997 (testimony), 2007, 2010
Stevens, Arthur	1910, 1911 1917, 1955, 1957, 1977, 1984, 1997–2000, 2018–2022 (testimony)
Tashjian, V. A. K.	2037
Usquaino, Phil	1984
Vidal, Theresa	1984, 1998, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010
Wallace, Jim	1977
Ward, Harry F.	1942, 1943
Wells, Wesley	2032, 2033

ORGANIZATIONS

	Page
American Civil Liberties Union.....	2 000
American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born.....	1960
American Peace Crusade... 1912, 1917, 1918, 1920, 1923, 1929, 1930, 1947, 1948, 1951	
Northern California.....	1918
Southern California.....	1912, 1917, 1918, 1920, 1925, 1928, 1947, 1948, 1950, 1952, 1953, 1955, 1957, 2021
San Diego Peace Forum.....	1911, 1912, 1915, 1917, 1918, 1920-1923, 1928, 1929, 1936, 1937, 1944-1952, 1958, 1966, 1974, 1977, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2021, 2025, 2036, 2038, 2040
American-Russian Institute (Los Angeles).....	1930, 1936, 1960, 1978
Bill of Rights Defense Committee.....	1913
California Labor School.....	1952, 1962, 1964
Civil Rights Congress.....	1909-1913, 1917, 1950, 1962, 1966, 1974, 1976, 2012, 2016, 2031-2035, 2037, 2038
Committee for a Far Eastern Policy.....	1924
Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights: San Diego.....	2006-2009
Community Unitarian Fellowship.....	1928, 1930, 1938, 1939, 1943-1945, 2006, 2007, 2018-2020
Emory Collier Defense Committee.....	1913, 2034
Hillcrest Community Unitarian Fellowship. (See Community Unitarian Fellowship.)	
Independent Progressive Party.....	1911-1913, 1917, 1950, 1952, 1962, 1966, 1967, 1973, 1982, 1983, 1997-1999, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010, 2018, 2023-2025, 2028, 2029, 2032, 2037, 2038.
Industrial Workers of the World.....	2031
International Labor Defense.....	2031
International Publishers.....	1949
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.....	1993
Little Theater Film Club.....	1937, 1977
Los Angeles Sobell Defense Committee. (See National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case.)	
Methodist Federation for Social Service.....	1942
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.....	2034
National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case: Los Angeles Sobell Defense Committee.....	2038
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.....	1936, 1937, 1959, 1954
National Negro Labor Council.....	2026-2030
New World Review.....	1954
New York Peace Council.....	1948
Northern California Peace Crusade. (See American Peace Crusade.)	
Paul Sleeth Defense Committee.....	1913
Peace Film Center.....	1978
Peace Notes.....	1947
Peace Reporter.....	1947, 1948
Political Affairs.....	1959
Progressive Book Store (Los Angeles).....	1958, 1959
San Diego Emergency Defense Committee.....	2032
San Diego Peace Forum. (See American Peace Crusade.)	
Southern California Peace Crusade. (See American Peace Crusade.)	
Teachers, American Federation of.....	1985, 1989
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.....	1946, 1947, 1950
Western Cinema Guild.....	1977, 1978

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3222

u, h, l

322 = NY pts 5-8

h

3223 = Ohio

def

3224 = LA pts 1-4

g

3225 = SD

h:

3226 = Rosenberg pts 1-2

